



Class

283.046

Book

Se 11

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

*From the Library of*

REVEREND AUGUSTUS VALLETTE CLARKSON

G. T. S. 1853

To the Rev  
William Perrian D.D.  
with the regards of  
The Author

A. V. Clarkson -



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2025









THE CONTINUITY  
OF  
**The Church of England**

IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY:

**Two Discourses:**

WITH

**AN APPENDIX AND NOTES.**

BY THE

REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.,

Rector of the Church of the Annunciation, New-York.

---

"We do not challenge a new Church, a new religion, or new Holy Orders; we obtrude no innovation upon others, nor desire to have any obtruded on ourselves; we pluck up the weeds, but retain all the plants of saving truth."

BRAMHALL.

"Concor Romanae et reformatae Ecclesiae fides,  
Neutrius opinio, mihi religio est."

---

New-York:

PUDNEY & RUSSELL,  
No. 79 JOHN-STREET.

1853.

ON THE SEABURY  
LIBRARY

183.04L

Se 11

46650

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, by PUDNEY & RUSSELL, in the Clerk's  
Office of the U. S. District Court for the Southern District of New-York.

---

YRABER CONT DEO  
YRABER

## PREFACE.

THE following discourses were designed to explain and defend the position of the Church of England, so far as it involves that of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States ; and they are published at the instance of several of the author's parishioners, whose partiality to him naturally led them to overrate their importance, and whose wishes a reciprocal feeling on his part rendered it impossible for him to resist.

The Appendix and Notes are intended to furnish documentary proof of the chief points made in the discourses, and to unfold, more fully than their limits allowed, some of the principles advanced in them.

The purpose of the first discourse is, to show that the Church of England, in renouncing the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, and reforming itself from the errors and corruptions of Popery, underwent no organic change, but retained the ministry, faith and sacraments of CHRIST, and fulfilled the conditions necessary to their transmission.

The resolution of the Church of England to be loyal to the State, and to maintain the Catholic Faith without the abuses and corruptions of later times, was firm and unyielding ; and the consequence was, that the Pope of Rome was at length constrained to command his subjects to leave the communion of a Church which he was unable to reclaim to his obedience. The attitude thus assumed by the papacy put an end for ever to all hopes of reconciliation between

the Church of England and the Church of Rome. It led immediately to the separation of the Romanists in England from the national Church; and the second discourse, and the notes appended to it, set before the reader the nature of this separation, (the first that was made from the Church of England after the Reformation,) and the agencies by which it was effected.

On the defection of the Romanists, the English nation found itself in possession of a Church, which was confessed by all to be "the eye of the Reformation,"\* and "the bulwark of Protestantism." Possessed of a primitive worship and a learned ministry, and debased by no mixtures of enthusiasm or superstition, this Church gave a definite purpose and permanent form to the awakened spirit of liberty and devotion. It stood forth the foremost defender of the rights and liberties of national Churches, (and through them of the individuals that composed them,) against a spiritual power, having its centre at Rome, but laying claim to universal dominion, and subjecting, as far as in it lay, the temporal power of every nation to its own control. It was able to detect the forgeries and impostures of Rome; it had given her no advantage by running from her into any extreme; it was a national body already formed; a body both Christian and legal; a body which commended itself to the civil powers by the loyalty of its constitution, and which was every way adapted to work in its members that sober and substantial piety which makes religion a "reasonable service."†

The Reformation virtually placed the appointment of the officers of this Church in the lay power, i. e. the power of the people; it also restored to the people the munificent endowments which the piety of their ancestors had bequeathed, to be held in trust for the sacred purposes for which they were given; and in all legislative and judicial matters (save only such as were *merely* spiritual) it put the temporal on a par with the spiritual power, so that "both their authorities and jurisdictions," to use the words of 24 Henry VIII. declaring the king the "supreme head of the Church of England,"

\* *Florentissima Anglia, Ocellus ille Ecclesiarum, Peculium CHRISTI singulare &c.*—*Diodati*.

† See London Cases, vol. ii. Argument for Union.

might "conjoin together in the due administration of justice, *the one to help the other.*" Moreover, this Church prescribed no *sinful term of communion*, the only thing which justified separation from the Church of Rome,\* and it laid no other limitation on natural liberty of conscience than the WORD OF GOD as held by the common sense of Christendom, or the universal judgment of the Church; in effect none other than is, by the consent of Christians from the apostles' time, laid on it by God himself under the Christian Dispensation. Whatever else this Church required, was considered by her to be in itself dispensable and mutable, and was required only for the sake of peace and union, and not as a term of communion necessary to salvation.

Such was the Church which the good providence of God, in the sixteenth century, bestowed on the people of England. It was only necessary that the English people should sustain and support their Church, by conforming to its services and co-operating with its ministry, in order to render it an effectual barrier against the return of Popery, and to incite the Catholic Churches of the several nations of Europe, then ripe for the movement, to reform themselves on the same model, and to free themselves from the same yoke. In a word, union and co-operation with their Church, on the part of the English people, would have kept her in the position which she had taken, and beyond which no advance has yet been made—the foremost in the progress of Christianity and civilization.

But, unhappily, the English people, as a body, did not co-operate

\* Calvin pronounces his judgment on this matter with characteristic boldness: "Wherever the Word of God is duly preached and reverently attended to, and the true use of the sacraments kept up, there is the plain appearance of a true Church, whose authority no man may safely despise, or reject its admonitions, or resist its counsels, or set at nought its discipline, much less separate from it, and violate its unity; for our Lord has so great regard to the unity of his Church, that he accounts him an apostate from his religion who obstinately separates from any Christian society which keeps up the true ministry of the Word and Sacraments. Such a separation is a denial of God and CHRIST; and it is a dangerous and pernicious temptation so much as to think of separating from such a Church, the communion whereof is never to be rejected, so long as it continues in the true use of the Word and Sacraments, though otherwise it be over-run with many blemishes and corruptions."—Quoted in *London Cases*, vol. ii., with reference to Institut. Lib. 4, Sect. 10, 11, 12.

with their Church. Remarkably enough, the secession of the Romanists, instead of cementing the union of those that remained, was soon followed by the separation, one after another, on various pretexts, of various bodies of Protestant Dissenters. Some of these demanded a more "spiritual" religion; others of them clamored for "the loaves and fishes," seeking to have their own denomination established by law, in place of the Church which they had left; and others of them declaimed against all establishment of religion by law; quoting our Lord's words, "My kingdom is not of this world," and making them good by letting his kingdom evaporate in a metaphor, that so there might be no spiritual body *in* though not *of* the world, to which a temporal government could be united; aiming to denationalize the Church, in order that they might evangelize the nation anew; to pull down for the sake of building up. In fine, instead of cleaving to the spiritual body already made to their hands, and working in and through it for the propagation of religion, the English people (who never disclaim for themselves the credit of being the most *practical* people on earth) have, in great numbers, looked with coldness on their Church; have attributed to it many faults which it has not, and shown no patience with those which it has; have, in a word, reviled and forsaken their Church, and arrayed themselves in hostility against it. To the beginning of this course they have, perhaps, been instigated more than they are willing to believe by the papists;\* in its progress they have been steadily assisted by the papists; and at this day they are in league with the papists for its consummation.

In justice, however, to the Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England, it should be remembered, that most of the secessions referred to took place under the Tudors and the Stuarts, before the government of Great Britain was settled on its present constitutional basis, and while the crown was, in most points, at war with the people, instead of being made, as now, to represent their opinions and to reflect their will.

In such a state of things, the *lay* power and influence which it

\* See Appendix V.

had been the purpose of the Reformation to assert and vindicate, passed to the people in name, but not in fact; the crown and parliament, who represented and exercised the legitimate lay element of the Church, having almost as little sympathy with the people as the Pope and his Cardinals who had absorbed and extinguished that element; and the people as a body being, under the one as well as the other, effectually shut out from the just sphere of their influence in the election of Church officers, the management of Church property, and the enactment of Church laws.

But, whatever may have been the causes of these secessions, the result has been to weaken the fences erected against the papal power, and to give it strength and activity for new aggressions. Instead of a compact national body, with its divinely appointed ministry and sacraments, its traditionary faith, its settled prescriptions and usages, and its well-defined and impregnable lines of opposition to the encroachments and corruptions of the papal power, the English people now present a distracted front of numerous sects, formed upon upstart theories, pursuing the most airy phantoms, and united in hostility to Rome only on grounds that are equally subversive of principles which lie at the foundation of the Christian religion, and give it all its permanence and vitality.

In asserting and vindicating personal rights and liberty in opposition to the encroachments of the crown and the aristocracy, the Protestant Dissenters were foremost; and I am as ready as any man to admire the sturdy independence and heroism which they displayed. Viewed, however, in reference to the spiritual despotism of which papal Rome was and is the head and centre, this contest was one of the people among themselves, the king and the peasant both belonging to the same body; and when the question is considered in this aspect, it cannot be denied that the Church of England has taken the lead in asserting and vindicating the rights and liberties of the people in opposition to papal usurpation and tyranny. So early as the sixteenth century the Church of England, (as it is, in part, the aim of the following pages to show,) had asserted the rights of the people and liberty of conscience; and had

placed both on a foundation than which the Protestants who have since separated from her communion have shown none, in my opinion, more definite and more stable.

The British Provinces, which afterwards became the United States, were chiefly settled by those Protestant Dissenters who, under the dynasty of the Tudors and the Stuarts, had asserted the cause of popular rights and liberty against the crown, and who, from the connection of Church and State, were naturally led to regard the Church, in the form in which it was established, as their enemy; and to make it, equally with the temporal government to which it was allied, the object of their assaults. They were settled also in part by members of the Church of England, who, in defending the principles of their Church, and opposing the counter opinions of the denominations around them, were as naturally led, in the contest between the crown and the people, to side with the former against the latter. I speak only, of course, of the tendencies of the two systems, making due allowance for individual exceptions. When the independence of the colonies was acknowledged, the relations of the parties were changed. Many of the supporters of the crown removed to the mother country, or to those colonies which still acknowledged her sovereignty; while those who remained soon ceased to be distinguished, by their political opinions, from the rest of their countrymen. On the other hand, the successors of those who had separated from the Church of England abated their jealousy and aversion towards the Episcopal Church. The introduction of bishops, which they had before so strenuously opposed as to render it in a high degree impolitic for the mother country to grant, they not only ceased to object to, but even consented to facilitate by all the good offices in their power. The divine institution of Episcopacy, the relative holiness of certain times and places set apart for religious purposes, the order for Daily, Morning and Evening Prayer, the forms for the administration of the holy Sacraments, and other ordinances, religious vestments, and all our distinctive doctrines and usages, which, when imposed under the crown by legal enactments, had been visited with unmitigated odium, began to find

favor with the people, when they were no longer sought to be bound on them without their own consent, and were upheld only by the moral power and sanction of the Church; and it is a remarkable fact that the Episcopal Church, which at the beginning of our civil independence was reduced almost to extinction, has grown to its present large and flourishing state chiefly by means of accessions from those religious bodies which had separated from the mother Church. The phase thus presented is, in truth, a new development of the Reformation; in which the rights (with their correlative duties) that were at first asserted for the crown in opposition to the papal supremacy, have at length passed to the people in fact as well as in name.

The natural inference from these facts is, that if the inhabitants of Great Britain wish to arrest the growth of Popery, they should rally around their Church, study its institutions, and imbibe its spirit, content, (as indeed they have reason to be happy) that, while living the Church's life, they may now exert that influence on her government which the silent change of their Constitution has secured for them; and that in this country the main security against the same evil consists in the distinct and firm avowal, by the Protestant Episcopal Church, of the Divine Institution of her ministry, and of those fundamental principles which she has received from the Church of England; and in not suffering her strength to be weakened, as her numbers are increased, by an infusion from religious bodies which reject those principles.

In the present day, the various religious bodies, Roman and Protestant, appear to be retracing their old lines of demarcation, and reconnoitering as if for a new conflict. The Romanists, in particular, emboldened by their powerful alliances on the Continent of Europe, by the fatuous concessions which have been made to them in Great Britain, and by the numbers with which the tide of immigration has swollen their ranks in this country, have assumed a more confident tone than at any previous time since the Reformation; repudiating, for the most part, the softened explanations of their tenets which they used to put forth, drawing tighter the reins of spiritual power,

seeking to make themselves felt as a distinct religious body in worldly politics, and being, in all respects, at much less pains than formerly to disguise the true theory and genius of their Church. In such a state of things, it is well for us to bear distinctly in mind the causes which led to their separation from the Church of England, in order that we may perceive the consequences which would result from a re-admission of their claims; and to be guarded, at the same time, against any concessions which may compromise the character of our Church as a *continuous* body; founded on the same Faith, governed by the same Ministry, united in the same Sacraments, quickened by the same Breath, living the same Life, nourished by the same Word, and being in very truth the same Body which our Lord Jesus Christ formed on earth before His ascension, and promised to be with, by the secret energy of the Holy Spirit, even unto the end of the world. If the following pages are found, by God's blessing, to further these ends, and help others in the detection of Roman errors without detriment to the Catholic Faith, the author's highest hopes respecting them will be realized.

THE  
Continuity of the Church of England.

DISCOURSE I.

HEBREWS xiii., 17.

“Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account.”

OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, who hath purchased to himself an universal Church, hath promised to be with the ministers of apostolic succession to the end of the world.\* By the ministers of apostolic succession are meant those who have succeeded to the Holy Apostles both in the orders which they received, in the doctrine which they taught, and in the right to govern the Church agreeably to the laws and institutions of our Saviour CHRIST; and it is on the supposition that they who now rule over us in our spiritual concerns have lawfully succeeded to the Holy Apostles in authority and doctrine, that we yield them due obedience, and rely on the promise of the Head of the Church to own us as His members, and to be present with us in the energy of that HOLY SPIRIT whom He hath sent from the FATHER.

No question is made of the apostolic succession of

\* “O Holy Jesus, who hast purchased to thyself an universal Church, and hast promised to be with the ministers of apostolic succession to the end of the world, be graciously pleased,” &c.—*Office of Institution in the Prayer-Book.*

the Church of England (from which the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States has confessedly derived both its orders and doctrine) until the time of the sixteenth century; none at least by any persons who own the Church of Christ to be a corporate body, capable of perpetuating itself, and of securing to its members forever the same rights with which they were originally invested. From the changes, however, which were then made in the Church of England, occasion has been taken to charge her with a departure from the Apostolic rule: to meet which objections, (such of them, at least, as are worthy of consideration,) I purpose on this day\* to vindicate our claim to the Apostolic Succession in Orders and Jurisdiction, touching also, incidentally, on the question of succession in doctrine. In other words, I purpose to show that the Church of England, in the eventful changes of the sixteenth century, preserved its own continuity, and maintained, as far as in it lay, the unity of Christ's mystical Body.

To understand the state of the question, it is necessary to premise that the Bishop of Rome had, in times preceding the Reformation, claimed to be the Head of the Catholic Church, the source and fountain of all its power and jurisdiction, and, in virtue of this alleged supremacy, to exercise a sovereign control over the English Church and nation. In the reign of Henry VIII., however, an occasion was given for an expression of the true sense of the English Church in reference to the ground and validity of this extravagant claim. For this monarch, who (whether deservedly or not) had been honored by the See of Rome with

\* The second Sunday in Lent, being one of the four stated times of Ordination.

the title of Defender of the Faith,\* and had received its apostolic benediction for himself and all his posterity, propounded to the Bishops and Clergy in the Provincial Synods of England, to the celebrated Universities, and to the great Monasteries of the kingdom, the following question, viz: “Whether the Bishop of Rome hath any greater jurisdiction conferred on him in Holy Scripture, in this realm of England, than any other foreign Bishop?”—requiring them, like men of virtue and profound literature, (so ran the directions to the University of Oxford,) diligently to intreat, examine, and discuss the same, and to return their opinions, in writing, under their common seal, to the “mere and sincere truth of the same.”†

This question lies at the foundation of the whole controversy, and it is therefore important to note both the answer and the unanimity with which it was given. The answer was, that “the Bishop of Rome has *not* any greater jurisdiction conferred on him in Holy Scripture, in this realm of England, than any other foreign Bishop.”

The declaration is guarded. It makes no reference to the Orders of the Roman Pontiff; that is, to his character as a Bishop or Vicar of CHRIST, but only to his jurisdiction or power of government.§ It does not deny the right of his jurisdiction in Italy, nor the fact of his jurisdiction in England. It simply denies that jurisdiction is conferred on him by the Divine Law in the realm of England. Within these limitations, how-

\* See Appendix A.

† See Appendix B.

‡ By Orders, is meant the power to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments of the New Law in the name of CHRIST. The power of conferring Orders, vested by Christ's institution exclusively in bishops, is derived to the Bishop of Rome in common with other bishops, called also vicars of CHRIST. Orders may exist without the power of jurisdiction, as in the case of a church possessed of a valid ministry and sacraments, but involved in heresy or schism. Jurisdiction, so far as it is *merely* spiritual, and conferred by CHRIST as the Head of the

ever, the denial is absolute, since no other foreign bishop pretended to any jurisdiction whatever in England.

In this answer all the bishops of England united, with the exception of Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. The Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the chapters and convents throughout the kingdom, gave one and the same answer: The Bishop of Rome has no greater jurisdiction conferred on him in Holy Scripture, in this realm of England, than any other foreign bishop; that is, under the limitations aforesaid, no jurisdiction whatever. In the deliberate judgment, therefore, of the Church of England, while yet it was in full communion with the Church of Rome, the jurisdiction which the Bishop of Rome had exercised in England was a human arrangement and not a divine ordinance; a power of man's concession and not of God's prescription.\*

Soon after this, Cranmer being Archbishop of Canterbury, a convocation of the English clergy was held at Lambeth, "to set forth a plain and sincere doctrine concerning the whole sum of all those things which appertain unto the profession of a Christian man." In this work, which was approved by the two archbishops and nineteen of the bishops, it was asserted as the

Church, cannot exist without Orders, and in connection with orders constitutes what is called the power of the Keys; that is, the power to define the Faith of Christ, (in other words, to declare what is and what is not heresy,) to absolve penitents, to excommunicate the openly vicious, to degrade unworthy clergymen, and, in general, to discharge all those functions which are necessary to preserve and continue the Church as a corporate or politic body, independent of the world. For further remarks on the subject of jurisdiction, and a comparative view of the doctrine of the Churches of Rome and England on the relation of the spiritual to the temporal power, see Appendix D.

\* See Appendix C.

sense of the English Church, that the Bishop of Rome, for several hundred years after Christ, had no primacy or governance above any other bishop out of his own province in Italy; that his existing power was the result of successive and gradual usurpations, and was exercised in violation of the ancient canons, and of his own oath, which bound him to observe the canons.

In making this declaration there was no intention to separate from the Catholic Church,\* or to disregard its authority. On the contrary, the declaration was justified by the ancient canons; according to which it was contended that the archbishops and bishops of every national church had power to order all matters within themselves, so long as they kept to the faith and unity of the Catholic Church.

The supreme jurisdiction of the realm being denied to the Bishop of Rome, devolved, so far as it was *merely* spiritual, to the Bishops of the English Church, and so far as it was outward and coercive, to the crown. Hence the next step in the Reformation was a parliamentary statute, declaring the King, for all purposes of outward and coercive jurisdiction, to be the Head of the English Church, and empowering him and his successors to redress and reform all abuses which may be lawfully reformed, to the increase of Christ's religion, and of the peace and unity of the realm.†

The way was now open for the Church of England, under the protection of the state, to do without the Bishop of Rome what it had in vain sought to do with him; that is, to correct sundry abuses and corruptions of religion which prevailed among the people. One of the first things done was to translate the Holy Scrip-

\* See 30th Canon of 1603, as quoted in the next sermon.

† See Appendix D.

tures of the Old and New Testaments. Some advances were also made towards allowing the use of the English language in the public services of the Church, by the publication of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, together with prayers, suffrages, and hymns, and select passages of Scripture for morning and evening devotion. A Litany also, much like that now in use, was set forth in English, to be said alternately by the priest and the people, together with some excellent prayers for private devotion. Creeping to the cross and other like superstitions were abolished.

Shortly afterwards, in the reign of Edward VI., the Holy Eucharist was administered in both kinds, and restored to its ancient character of a communion as well as a sacrifice; while the office for administering it was adapted to these changes, and translated into the English language.

A commission was also appointed, consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other learned and discreet bishops, to prepare a complete collection of divine offices in the English language, and the result was the Book of Common Prayer, which was first used on Whitsunday, 1549.\* In 1552 the Prayer-Book was again set forth by Convocation, with some alterations, together with the Articles of Religion and a Book of Ordination, the same for substance as those which are now in use.

These changes were made with the consent of the archbishops and a large majority of the bishops. Some five or six of the bishops dissented,† and these were

\* See Appendix E.

† Viz: Bonner of London, Gardiner of Winchester, Day of Chichester, Heath of Worcester, Voysey of Exeter, and Tunstall of Durham. The two latter are said by some to have resigned.

displaced, and others were ordained and settled in their sees according to the laws of the Church and the usual customs of those times.

Thus far at least there was no departure from the Apostolical Succession either in orders or in doctrine. Not in orders, for the bishops then living were, by the confession of all parties, the lawful successors of the Apostles: not in doctrine, for the rule by which they proceeded in the changes which they made was the Word of God, interpreted by catholic tradition and all truly universal councils. They avowed their determination to reform abuses and corruptions, but they at the same time avowed their willingness to submit, in all matters affecting the peace and unity of the Church, to the decision of the Catholic or Universal Church expressed by a free general council. They alleged, however, what is undoubtedly true, that for several hundred years there had been no really universal council: that in the then state of Christendom such a council was impracticable; that there was no power of competent jurisdiction to convoke it; and that the abuses and corruptions of the day were too flagrant for their reformation to be longer postponed. Under these circumstances, they considered that the only way in which, while reforming abuses, they could testify their submission to the Catholic Church, was to proceed by the rule which I have mentioned, viz: the Word of God, as interpreted by catholic tradition; that is, by a *continual succession of witnesses* up to the time of the Apostles.

By this rule the Church of England consented to be tried; and while adhering to this rule, it is manifest that she could not depart from the Apostolic Succession in doctrine. The face of the Church, indeed, be-

fore and after this reformation of abuses, was different; and hence the crafty sophist or the superficial observer is ready to exclaim: "You have a new Church; you do not adore in the Eucharist that which the priest lifts up in his hands before the people; you do not require auricular confession; you do not worship images; you have no masses for bringing souls out of purgatory; you administer the Eucharist in both kinds. Surely, whether these things are right or wrong, you cannot pretend to be the same Church you were before; you have departed from the succession of doctrine." To which the simple answer is, that these and all like matters contained in the new creed of the Church of Rome are either beside or contrary to the Word of God, as interpreted by catholic tradition and the truly oecumenical councils. In other words, they are either beside or contrary to the Faith of the Catholic Church, and are therefore no proof that we have not succeeded to the doctrine of the Apostles.\*

On the death of Edward VI., and the accession of

"\* To their usual question, then, 'Where was the Protestant Church or Religion before Luther?' I answer, *first*, That it was there, where their whole religion cannot, as they grant, be found, in the Holy Scriptures. *Secondly*, it was, as Bishop Usher saith well, where their Church was, in the same Place, though not in the same State and Condition. The Reformation, or Protestantism, did not make a new Faith or Church, but reduced things to the primitive purity; plucked not up the good seed, the Catholic Faith or true worship, but the after-sown tares of error, as image worship, purgatory, &c., which were ready to choke it. Did the Reformation in Hezekiah or Josiah's days set up a new Church or religion different in essence from the old one? Had it not been a ridiculous impertinency for one that knew Naaman before, while he stood by, to ask, where is Naaman? And being answered, this is he, for the inquirer, to reply, it cannot be he, for Naaman was a leper—this man is clean. Was not Naaman, formerly a leper and now cleansed, the same person? A field of wheat in part weeded is the same it was as to ground and seed, not another. In like manner, the true visible Christian Church, cleansed and unclean, reformed and unreformed, is the same Church altered, not as to essence or substance, but quality or condition."—*Mr. Samuel Gardiner*, one of the writers in Gibson's Collection of Tracts.

Queen Mary to the throne of England, the affairs of the Church ceased for a time to be conducted by the archbishops and bishops of the English Church, and were managed by the authority of the Pope and of the five or six bishops who had been displaced in the previous reign.

The Pope of Rome, we contend, had no jurisdiction in the English Church except by the consent of the English Church, and consequently the acts and regulations of the Pope, in concurrence with the few bishops who had been deposed by their lawful superiors, had no canonical force, but were utterly null and void. Aided, however, by the temporal power, these foreign intruders expelled the majority of the lawful bishops and substituted others in their place. Nor was this all: but, having procured the re-enactment of statutes (which had been humanely repealed in the two preceding reigns) for the punishment of heretics by death, they had the effrontery and the cruelty to burn as heretics men who were better Catholics than themselves, and whom they were bound, by the canons, to reverence as the lawful bishops and spiritual fathers of the Church. "Come," they said, "these are the heirs; let us kill them, and the inheritance shall be ours."

But it pleased God to baffle their designs. The reign of Mary, though violent, was of short duration; and on the accession of Elizabeth, the bishops of Queen Mary's days either withdrew or were deprived of their Sees. One only was suffered to conform.\* They were

\*The bishop who conformed, was Anthony Kitchen, who had been a sort of Vicar of Bray, taking care, in all the changes, to keep in favor with the dominant party. The other bishops, who either resigned or were deprived (some fourteen or fifteen in number), were schismatics, inasmuch as they had either come into the places of lawful bishops during the life of the latter, or had received consecration from, or held communion with, bishops who had been thus schis-

not the lawful bishops of the Church of England, but had held their places by violence and usurpation under a foreign jurisdiction. Besides, they had shed innocent blood; they were believed, on good grounds, to hold doctrines subversive of the government in the State, and they upheld some of the most flagrant abuses and corruptions in the Church. There was, therefore, no reason, either of justice or expediency, for allowing them to remain. In the Providence of God, five of the lawful bishops of the Church under Edward VI., were still alive. These were now recalled, and all but one united in settling the Church in that reformed state which had been so rudely and unlawfully assailed. By these the succession of bishops was preserved, and has ever since been regularly continued; so that the authority of the bishops who have succeeded to them, both in respect of orders and jurisdiction, is beyond reasonable question.

On a review of these facts, two or three remarks may be thought worthy of attention:

It has become common of late to extenuate the cruelties exercised towards the Reformed Bishops in Queen

atically intruded. I am not aware that they themselves pleaded principle as their reason for withdrawal; and if they had, the plea, considering their antecedents, would have carried but little weight. Burnet and Bramhall say expressly, that they hoped, by acting in concert, to intimidate the Queen. I add, in the words of Dr. Saywell, "they usurped their places by turning out the metropolitans, and a major part of the bishops of each province, and so could have no lawful authority or jurisdiction. Queen Elizabeth therefore set them aside, and so removed this violence and usurpation; and being willing to restore all things as they were settled in King Edward's reign, she calls back the bishops that were still alive, which were only five in number; Bishops Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, Kitchin and Thirlby, and all but Thirlby concurred in settling the Reformation. So we had still the major part of the lawful bishops to renew the succession; and they did ordain Archbishop Parker, and others, and it has been regularly continued ever since. Thus the authority of our present bishops as to order, is beyond dispute." (See Dr. Saywell's "Reformation of the Church of England, justified according to the canons of the Council of Nice, and other general councils, and the tradition of the Catholic Church." Cambridge, A. D. 1688.)

Mary's reign, by attributing them to the temper of the age, which, as is pretended, infected all parties alike, and incited each that was in the ascendancy to persecute its opponents. But what are the facts in this case? That the chief of the Reformed Bishops were burnt at the stake as heretics is certain;\* and, on the other hand, it is equally certain that, when the reformed party, in the reign of Elizabeth, obtained the ascendancy, the Roman bishops were treated in a very different manner. They were, it is true, and for good reason, dispossessed of their Sees, to which they had no just title; but not one of them was treated with severity in consequence of anything done in the previous reign. Most of them were suffered to live with their friends; two of them spent the remainder of their days under the roof of Archbishop Parker, and one of them was honorably buried by him at his death. Let us not extenuate the conduct of the one party at the expense of the other; especially when it is also at the expense of truth and justice.†

Attempts, indeed, are often made to excite odium against the Reformed Church of England, and sympathy in behalf of her Papal opponents, in consequence of a series of events which began soon after to be unfolded. But when these facts are placed in their true light, the character of the English Church, for moderation and charity, will not suffer. In the first part of the reign of Elizabeth, the kingdom almost universally acquiesced in the Reformation. The deprived bishops

\* This was bad enough; but what aggravated the atrocity of the proceeding is, that the statute under which they were convicted, and condemned to the stake, and which had been abrogated by 25 Henry VIII., Cap. 14, and again by 1 Edward VI., Cap. 3, was revived and re-enacted under Mary, as if for the very purpose of applying it to the Reformers. For a fuller view of this topic the reader is referred to Appendix G.

† For the grounds on which these statements are made, see Appendix H.

formed no party against it, and the clergy of the Church, with a remarkable unanimity, came into the use of the Reformed Liturgy. In the eleventh year of that reign, however, the then Pope of Rome (Pius V.), finding the attempts of his predecessor (Pius IV.) to recover the kingdom by arts and persuasion fruitless,\* issued his bull of excommunication and deposition against the Queen, absolving all her subjects from their oaths of allegiance.† This it was, which gave an entirely new aspect to the controversy, and led to all the subsequent troubles. That the Pope of Rome should send missionaries into England in opposition to the lawful bishops of that Church, was indeed a violation of the ancient canons, but not an offence which should have been visited by temporal penalties; but to send his emissaries into England to preach sedition and rebellion to the people, was an offence against the State; and, if the State saw fit to punish such offences with rigor, there is no reason to blame the Church; nor, even if we should approve of some of the political sentiments of the offenders, are we bound to sympathize with them as “missionary priests” and ministers of Christ, while they abuse their office to the purposes of political faction. For, even if such men have been unjustly condemned for treason to the State, this is no proof that they were martyrs for Christ.

It is difficult to review the extraordinary events by which the Church of England has been enabled to maintain and vindicate her title to the Apostolic succession, both in orders and doctrine, without believing that she is yet to answer some great ends in the design of Divine Providence. The intelligent and consistent

\* See Appendix I.

† See the next Sermon, and Appendix L.

members of this Church have ever been most firmly persuaded that her succession, both of right and of fact, to the orders and faith of the Apostles, is the ground on which the errors of the Roman Church may be most successfully combated. All other opposition, however noisy and boastful, begins with a virtual surrender, and must necessarily end in defeat. For, when the question is as to identity with a society and doctrine which began more than eighteen centuries ago, what is it but a surrender to renounce, in the very outset, all pretence of succession to the founders of that society, and the original propagators of that doctrine? The Church of Rome knows this, and knows the immense advantage which the Protestant cause would derive from a valid claim to the Apostolic succession. Hence, there is no fact which her emissaries have more strenuously denied, or resorted to more unworthy arts to obscure, than the validity of the Anglican orders. And it is matter of wonder and regret that Protestants generally, including many estimable members of our own communion, should consent to further her interests by affecting to treat the subject with ridicule; or to represent us as in covert alliance with the Church of Rome, because we refuse to abandon the only solid ground on which her errors may be met and refuted.

During the past week, we have daily offered the prayer that Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hath purchased to himself an universal church, by the precious blood of his dear Son, would mercifully look upon the same, and that he would at this time so guide and govern the minds of His servants, the bishops and pastors of His flock, that they may lay hands suddenly on no man, but faithfully and wisely make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of His Church;

that He would give His grace and heavenly benediction to all those who are ordained to any holy function; that he would replenish them with the truth of His doctrine, and endue them with innocency of life, that they may faithfully serve before Him, to the glory of His great name, and the benefit of His holy Church. It is impossible to offer this prayer, and not to connect with it the ardent desire that suspicions and jealousies may be removed, and heats and contentions allayed, so that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be united in a peaceful and charitable temper. In this way only can we promote the advancement of religion and the salvation of mankind; and let those who sincerely desire this end, consider that the way to promote the glory of God, and the peace and unity of His Church, is not to impose the private opinions of Roman schoolmen, nor the extravagant devices of modern reformers, but to maintain the truly ancient and Apostolic faith, devotion and discipline, delivered and recommended by the Word of God, and the example of the Primitive and Catholic Church.

THE  
Continuity of the Church of England.

DISCOURSE II.

HEBREWS xiii., 17.

“Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account.”

THE right to govern, to which the duty of obedience is correlative, is not here rested on the possession of extraordinary and miraculous powers, such as were necessary to the first settlement of the Christian Church in the world, but on the possession of those standing and ordinary powers which are necessary to the preservation of the Christian Church, in all ages, as an orderly society. Obey them who “have the rule over you,” who “watch for your souls;” and who, having received this trust from the Divine Head of the Church, either immediately (as did the Apostles) or at the hands of those whom He has commissioned to convey it, must at last “account” to him for the discharge of it. Hence the inspired precept is one, not of partial and temporary, but of universal and perpetual obligation in the Christian Church; and evidently supposes a succession of officers in it, to whom its members are always and everywhere bound to submit themselves in all matters which they enjoin out of the Word of God, or agreeably to the same, for the conservation of its peace and unity. “Obey them that have the rule over

you, and submit yourselves ; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account."

Accordingly, it hath been the constant belief of the Church that our Lord provided from the beginning for the maintenance of a continual and orderly succession of pastors ; that He sent His Apostles as His Father had sent Him ; that is, with authority to send others in His name, the power of propagating itself being an element of the original commission ; and consequently, that the spiritual rulers whom we are bound to obey, are not such as have taken the office of the Christian ministry on themselves, or derived it from the people, but such as have received both the faith and doctrine of Christ, and the authority to administer His sacraments, by an uninterrupted succession from the Holy Apostles, and hold the same as a most precious trust or deposit, for the custody and conveyance of which they are responsible to God. Hence, when we are accosted with the ensnaring question which is put to Protestants by the emissaries of the court of Rome, " Who were the ministers of God that gathered that society of men with whom you are now united ? " we answer, directly to the point : The society with which we are now united has been propagated from the Church of England, and the Church of England has been propagated by an unbroken succession of pastors and doctrine from the Apostles of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST.

The only objection of any moment which is made in rejoinder, is drawn from the changes which took place in the state of the English Church at the time of its reformation from Popery. In a previous discourse I reviewed those events, and assigned some of our reasons for believing that the Apostolic Succession, both

in orders and doctrine, was, by the good Providence of God, continued during those troublous times.

From this review it appears, I apprehend, that the Church of England at that time separated from no other body or society of Christians. She simply affirmed that the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome in England was founded on no divine warrant; that it had been the result of encroachments on the one side, and concessions on the other; that it had been proved, after a long and full trial, to be burdensome to the people, and operative of manifold evils; that it had been endured long enough, and ought to be at once and forever declined. The separation, if such it were, was from the court of Rome, in respect to its claim of jurisdiction in England, and not from the Church of Rome in respect to any points of faith or order that had been ruled by the Catholic Church. Leaving the Bishop of Rome to govern the Church of Rome, and the Churches also of such other countries as deemed it for their benefit to continue subject to his jurisdiction, the Church of England, under the protection of the State, resumed the responsibility of governing herself and her own members, agreeably to the Word of God and Catholic tradition. She remodeled her ritual, translated her prayers and offices from a dead to a living language, and made such other changes as she judged needful to meet and to guide the awakening spirit and intelligence of the age. No change, however, was made which shocked the feelings, or offended the consciences of her members, as may be inferred from the fact that, of the 9,400 clergy of the realm, only 177 refused to take the oath acknowledging the supremacy of the Queen, which was not administered until after the changes were

made.\* Nor is this to be wondered at, for the reformation from popery had been gradual; the minds of the people were prepared for each successive step; and when the reformation was completed, the Church of England remained the same Church as before; having departed from no rule of Apostolic order, nor relinquished any one point of the Catholic faith; having separated herself from no other Church, nor separated any other from herself; and having continued to retain in her bosom the great body of her clergy and people.

For the space of eleven or twelve years after these changes were made, the Romanists, as a sect distinct from the Church of England, had no existence. The Christian people of that country continued, after the reformation as before, to attend their parish churches, and to be in communion with their lawful pastors: and the attendance was voluntary; the penal statutes which afterwards subjected the Church to so much obloquy having not then been enacted, and the people being constrained to attend the authorized service under no severer compulsion than one which was intended as a check on idle and vagrant persons, and imposed a fine of one shilling (to be collected and given to the poor) for absence from church on the Lord's day. Even they who had been at first opposed

\* "The Parliament being dissolved, by authority of the same the Liturgy was forthwith brought into the Churches in the vulgar tongue; images were removed without tumult; the oath of supremacy offered to the Popish bishops and others of the Ecclesiastical profession, which most of them had sworn unto in the reign of Henry the Eighth. As many of them as refused to swear were turned out of their livings, dignities, and bishopricks; and those (as themselves have written) in the whole Realm, which reckoneth more than 9,400 Ecclesiastical promotions, not above 80 parsons of churches, 50 prebendaries, 15 presidents of colleges, 12 archdeacons, as many deans, 6 abbots and abbesses, and 14 bishops, being all which sate, saving onely Antony, Bishop of Llandaff, the calamity of his See."—*Camden Hist. of Eliz.* p. 28.

to the changes, united, at least outwardly, with the Reformed Church in prayer and sacraments;\* and there was a fair prospect that the pious care of the Church for the better instruction and reformation of her members, would be requited by their loyal attachment and steadfast devotion, and that the Catholic Faith would be kept by all in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace.

What was it, then, that first resisted and obstructed this movement of the Church of England for the improvement and edification of her people? What was it that first separated a portion of the members of that Church from her fold, formed them into a new sect, in opposition to their lawful pastors, and led to the erection of altar against altar, and communion against communion? The distinct answer to these questions is, that, in the year 1569, the then bishop of Rome issued a proclamation, in which, after premising that he, as the successor of St. Peter, was made by the Most High "Prince over all people and all kingdoms.

\* "And the Queen, the nobility, the gentry, the clergy, and the main body of the nation, were so well satisfied of the unlawful authority of those bishops that were set aside, and the undoubted right of those who ordained Archbishop Parker, that of about 9,400 clergy, above 9,200 did, with great joy, receive the bishops and the reformation, and the rest of the nation, even those that were formerly zealous for the Church of Rome, did join with them in prayers and sacraments, and there was an universal agreement and concurrence in the commencement of the Church of England for ten or eleven years together, so that there was no other penal law but that of 12*d.* a Sunday, to stir up lazy people to mind their duty; and we might have continued so till this day in that happy concord, had not the Pope excommunicated and deposed the Queen, and prohibited all her subjects, under pain of an anathema, to own her sovereignty, and submit to the Bishops of the Church of England. Upon which many separated from our communion, and have disturbed our government ever since; so that it is plain the schism is on the side of the Papists, who, upon pretence of Papal authority, did withdraw themselves from the communion of their own bishops, and make a formal division in the Church, which was before united in peace and truth."—*Dr. Saywell*, A.D., 1688. See, also, Appendix I.

to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant and build," he proceeds to excommunicate the Queen of England and all her adherents, adding: "We moreover do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity and privilege whatsoever; and also the nobility, subjects and people of the said kingdom, and all others who have in any sort sworn unto her, to be forever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance and obedience; and we do also, by authority of these presents, absolve them, and do deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things before named. And we do command and charge all and every, the noblemen, subjects, people and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her orders, mandates and laws; and those which shall do the contrary, we do include them in the like sentence of anathema."\*

Under the authority of this bull the emissaries of the Bishop of Rome came into England and labored for the accomplishment of these two ends: 1. To seduce the people of England from allegiance to their lawful sovereign; and 2. To draw them away from the Church of England, and to form them into separate congregations for the celebration of divine service, according to the Roman use. In the former object they failed, though not until after a long and obstinate struggle, in which the government was compelled, for its own preservation, to resort to measures of great severity for their suppression.† In the latter object they were partially successful. They seduced many of the disaffected members of the Church of England

\* See the Bull of Pius V., Appendix K.

† See Appendix L.

from the communion of their lawful pastors, and formed them into separate congregations, which soon came to be governed by what are called titular bishops, *i. e.*, bishops who did not fill the ancient sees of the realm; who were not consecrated according to the ancient canons by the archbishop and bishops of the province to which they belonged; who, in fact, had no dioceses, but exercised their functions in England on fictitious titles, and in virtue of no other authority than that which was founded on the exploded right of the Bishop of Rome to jurisdiction in England: that is, in virtue of no divine authority at all. From that time to the present, the two parties have continued to hold, each towards the other, much the same relative position. On the one side, the ancient church with its bishops in the ancient dioceses, deriving their merely spiritual authority, as successors of the Apostles from Christ, and with its ritual reformed from popery and restored to the simplicity of the primitive age; and, on the other side, the new seceders gathered around leaders who have been obtruded on the country by a foreign power, whose orders are vitiated by their notorious disregard to ancient canons, whose jurisdiction is null and void, from the fact of its being exercised in opposition to the lawful bishops of the country; (those bishops, I mean, to whom they are bound to be subject by the law of Christ and the canons of the Catholic Church, for I throw out of consideration the laws of the land;) and who are identified with the Church of England in the Catholic faith which she has retained, and distinguished from her only by an adherence to the popery which she has rejected.

Now, in regard to this separation, I remark—

1. That it was unnecessary. Their Church, the Church of England, had provided for them a Liturgy, which, if not unexceptionable, at least contained all things necessary to salvation. She had preserved for them entire the faith into which they had been baptized, as it had been professed and defined in the four universal councils (which Pope Gregory the Great used to revere as the four gospels): the councils of Nice and Constantinople, of Ephesus and Chalcedon. She had distinguished, as was meet, the two sacraments of the gospel—Baptism and the Holy Eucharist—and provided for their most solemn celebration; according to them that pre-eminence in which they have been always and everywhere held in the Christian Church. She had provided, also, decent and edifying forms for the administration of those other five institutions, which are less properly called sacraments, viz.: orders, absolution, confirmation, matrimony, and the visitation of the sick and dying. She appealed then, as she does now, for her justification to the Word of God and Catholic tradition; having rejected only those things which were either unknown to the Catholic Church of the first three or four centuries, or which had not been ruled, by the universal councils just mentioned, as of necessity to salvation. What sufficed for salvation *then* must suffice *now* and always, to the end of time. All this the Church of England had provided; the only faults which can, without captiousness, be found with her services, are faults of omission in things not necessary; faults which, if real, are far more tolerable than the crusts and overlayings which she had removed; such, for example, as the incorporation of notorious fables into her ritual.\* The Church of England, there-

\* See Appendix M.

fore, had given her members no just occasion for separation, and hence the separation was unnecessary.

2. That the separation was wilful; by which I mean that it was an unwarranted exercise of private judgment in opposition to lawful authority. The changes that were made did not extend to points that had been ruled by the Catholic Church; that is to say, by the four universal councils which were held before the external communion of the Church was interrupted. All matters of this nature were considered as settled. The changes that were made related only to matters that were controverted; and these were made in an orderly and synodical way by the authorized guides of the national church. For her justification in this course, the Church of England may plead the voice of reason, the command of Scripture, and the precedents of antiquity. Reason teaches us that in every society there must be authority to decide controversies among its members. Christ our Saviour has constituted this authority in His church, and commanded us to obey it. The universal councils of Nice and Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, acted on this principle in defining the faith in opposition to the Arian and Macedonian heresies. "And not only the general councils have exercised this authority, but particular churches also, in national councils, in the councils of Orange, Milevis and others, have used the same power over their children, whom they were bound to teach and govern, and for whose souls they were to account to God; and they did no more than was their right, so long as they did it with submission to the general church to whom they were subject; for Christ said to the Apostles, and by them to all the guides of souls that should succeed them in a lawful ordination, 'He that hears you, hears me, and he that despises you, de-

spices me.—*Nt. Cyp. Ep. 69.*”\* This is what the Church of England did in those doctrines which were controverted at the time of the reformation, and which had been determined by no universal council. She declared her own sense in these controversies, and determined which side should be received and professed for truth by her members. And to these determinations her members were bound to submit, not as to infallible verities, but as to probable truths; and to rest in the decisions of their Church until it should be made plain by as great or greater authority that these decisions were erroneous. Suppose, then, and this is the most that can be pretended, that the decisions of the particular Church of England, in the controversies of that day, seemed to any of her members to be contrary to the doctrine of the universal church, still they were obliged, on these principles—principles which all Catholics acknowledge—to silence and peace, and not to profess or to act in opposition to the determination of their Church; and this for the very sufficient reason that the public profession of a controverted dogma is not necessary, but the preservation of the peace and unity of the Church is.† But these seceders set up their own opinions on controverted doctrines, against the determination of their Church; and they acted on these opinions so as to erect a rival altar and a separate communion. Their separation, therefore, was wilful and factious.

3. Had this separation been made under the direction of the deposed bishops, it might then have had, though no adequate sanction, yet some semblance of

\* Bishop Sparrow, Preface to Collection of Articles, &c., of the Church of England.

† Ibid.

authority. But the chief of the deposed bishops kept aloof; and the separation from the Church does not appear to have been made under the conduct of any who either then were, or ever had been, its lawful bishops. It was made at the instigation of a foreign bishop, or of persons acting under his instructions; and that foreign bishop the same whom all (both the acting and deprived) bishops of England had declared, almost with one voice, to have no jurisdiction in that country; but who, though disowned and expelled by the constituted authorities, both of the Church and the State, still continued to intrude his agents into the country, that he might make for himself a party for the avowed purpose of bringing the Church, and through the Church the State, under his own rule and dominion. No claim, as it seems to me, can be wilder, than that of a monarch at Rome to a supremacy, either spiritual or temporal, in England; nor anything more unnatural or uncatholic, more wild and fanatical, than for professed Christians to separate from the Church of their native country, and from their lawful bishops, and to put themselves in subjection to the monarch of a foreign and distant land.

A separation thus unnecessary, thus wilful, thus extravagant, has no mark, that I can see, to distinguish it from a guilty schism. The members of the Church of England, therefore, who at this time separated from her communion, became thereby schismatics; and the Church of Rome, which caused and encouraged this, as she has manifold other schisms, for her own temporal aggrandizement, is responsible for the schism, and infected with its guilt. It is in vain for Romanists to retort that the Church of England had before withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. That withdrawal was the act of their own men; and

if it be schismatical, then were the opponents and persecutors of the reformers, Heath, Bonner, Gardiner, Tonstall, Stokesly, Thirlby, etc., the schismatics. In vain do they rail against the Church of England for acknowledging the king as the supreme head; for what is meant by this title (to pass by the fact of its having been sanctioned by their own party) is not, that the sovereign has, in his own person, or that he can communicate to others, any part of that power of orders and jurisdiction which Christ left to his Church, but only that he has power to see that all subjects, as well ecclesiastical as others, do their duties in their several stations, and co-operate in their appointed functions for the public good.\* In vain do they seek to reproach the Church with having taken her religion from Parliament, since all the changes which were made in her services were approved by the Church herself in her convocations or synods, *before* they were enacted in Parliament.† These and the like frivolous pretexts are of no avail to exonerate them from the charge of having needlessly and wilfully separated from the Church of England, and formed themselves into congregations independent of her jurisdiction, and under a foreign power.

In this view of the case will be found the explanation, 1st., of the name which we apply to those professed Christians who are subject to the Bishop of Rome; and, 2d., of the attitude which we hold towards them in controverted questions:

\* See Appendix D.

† For example, the question of the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome was submitted, as we have seen, to the Clergy, and resolved by them before it was made the subject of statute in Parliament. In like manner, the Book of Common Prayer, the Ordinal, and the Articles of Religion, were approved and adopted by the convocation of the Clergy before they were enjoined by Parliament. See also Appendix N.

1. The Church of England had, from her origin, been accounted to be that part of Christ's Catholic Church which existed in England. In her reformation from Popery she had religiously abstained from all innovations in the Catholic faith, having taken for her rule the Word of God, as interpreted by Catholic tradition. She retained the Catholic creeds, and obliged her members, on every occasion of public worship, to profess their belief in the Holy Catholic Church. It was not, therefore, to be expected that her faithful members should give the name of Catholics to an aggregation of men that seceded from her communion, and set up a rival worship within her own jurisdiction. These seceders were separatists and schismatics; and they, therefore, like other sects, very naturally received a name from their distinctive tenet, being called Romanists and Papists from their adherence to the government and Pope of Rome in opposition to their lawful bishops. These designations were not, therefore, originally bestowed, nor have they been since continued, from any want of Christian courtesy; they were adopted naturally, and on principle, and have been since continued among us by a consistent regard to our own position, and a just adherence to historic truth.\*

2. The relation in which we are placed to the Romanists in consequence of their separation from our communion, A. D. 1569, by order of Pius V., deserves to be borne in mind in the discussion of questions controverted between us. For inasmuch as we were passive, and the formal act of separation was made by them, we are not bound to show cause why we remain in the Church, but they are bound to show cause why

\* See Appendix O.

they left it. The separation is their concern and not ours; they are bound to purge themselves from the sin of schism, but we are not bound to confute the arguments by which they seek to maintain and defend their schism. It is enough for us that their arguments are not directly conclusive, and we are not obliged to listen to any other arguments than such as are directly conclusive. They are bound to vindicate and prove the principle on which they separated, and to show, by plain and invincible proofs, that we should adopt the same principle; and, if they fail in this attempt, the whole controversy, in all rational and christian judgment, is at an end.\* Now what is this principle?

It is not that the particular propositions debated between us are necessary *as a means* of salvation; so that our ignorance or disbelief of them puts us out of the way of salvation. This is manifest, both from the nature of the propositions and from the evidence on which they rest. Belief in GOD, the FATHER ALMIGHTY; in his adorable SON, JESUS CHRIST; in His incarnation, passion and death; in His glorious resurrection and ascension, and in his second coming to judgment; and belief in the HOLY GHOST, who proceedeth from the FATHER, and whom the SON, agreeably to His gracious promise, hath sent from the FATHER to rule and comfort His mystical body, the Holy Catholic Church; to unite its members, present and departed, on earth and in Paradise, in one communion of Saints; to be the principle of a new and heavenly life to their souls and bodies, delivering their souls from the bands of sin in this world, and raising their bodies, in God's good time, from the corruption of the grave, and advancing the whole man, body and soul, to life everlasting, in

\* See two Discourses of the learned Henry Dodwell: Quarto, London, A. D. 1688.

the kingdom of glory; this belief, I say, or belief in the several articles of the Apostles' creed, is seen at once to be intrinsically necessary to salvation through Christ; so that ignorance or disbelief of it puts a man out of the way of salvation through JESUS CHRIST. And the extrinsic evidence of its divine origin is such that its rejection argues a most culpable levity or obliquity of mind: for the doctrine is plainly contained in the original records of our faith, and is moreover attested by the constant tradition of the Catholic Church in every age and place from the beginning.

Now, compare with these immutable verities of the Christian faith, the points that are controverted between the Romanists and us; as, *e. g.*: That that which the priest (after the consecration of the elements in the Holy Eucharist) takes in his hand and holds up before the people, is to be adored with the adoration due to God; that the images of Christ and the Virgin Mary, and the other saints, are to be had and kept, and duty of honor and worship is to be given to them; that the state of most souls, departed in the faith of Christ, is a purgatory; that a few others (called saints) now reign together with Christ, and that these are to be invoked, and their earthly relics worshipped; that whole and entire Christ, and the true sacrament, are received under one only species, that of bread; and, to name no more, that the definitions of the council of Trent, all and every one, concerning original sin and justification, are to be firmly embraced and received. These propositions are manifestly no more than the determinations of curious questions and scholastic disputes; so that, even supposing them true, the belief of them is not necessary to salva-

tion. We may adore our blessed Saviour in the celebration of the holy mysteries, without adoring that which the priest holds up to the gaze of the people. We may be saved, I trust, without worshiping the images of the Virgin Mary and other saints; without worshiping their relics, and without believing, with an undoubting faith, that they themselves now reign with Christ, while their bodies, which are part of themselves, are yet mingled with the dust.\* If we are in error in believing that the souls of the faithful departed are in a state of peace and refreshment, expecting with holy hope the resurrection of their bodies, their acquittal in judgment, and their admission to the kingdom of glory, it is at least difficult to see how our salvation can be promoted by exchanging this comforting doctrine for the revolting belief that they cannot attain to the final consummation of their hopes, except through a process of purgatorial torment. And if we receive the sacrament in both kinds, as our Lord commanded, it can never be necessary for us to be resolved whether whole Christ and a true sacrament be received under one kind only or not.

That these propositions are not, even in the opinion of Romanists themselves, so necessary but that they may be ignored or disbelieved without peril to salvation, appears from these two considerations:

First. That in the Church of Rome, and in the churches in communion with her, all who are baptized, as well adults as infants, are baptized into no other faith than that which is contained in the Apostles' creed. I would not advance this argument if the

\* An exception, however, should be made in the case of the Virgin Mary, for whose bodily presence in heaven the Roman Church has consistently provided by the story of the Assumption. See Appendix M.

Roman creed, which contains these controverted propositions were, like the Nicene creed, an expansion or explanation of the Apostles' creed. Every man, however, who compares the two, may see that it is not; but that the former contains several distinct propositions, no germ of which is to be found in the latter.\* Assuming, then, the matter of the two creeds, the Catholic creed and the Roman creed to be substantially different, I argue that Romanists themselves do not believe the latter to be of the same necessity to salvation as the former; for, if they do, why are they not baptized into it? In fact, no member of the Roman communion has been baptized into the Roman creed; all the members of that communion have been baptized only into the Catholic creed; and they are obliged to believe and profess the matters contained in the Roman creed, not by their baptismal vows, but by the order of the Bishop of Rome.†

The other consideration is, that the Roman Church excuses all those of its own communion who disbelieved these controverted doctrines prior to the definition of them by the council of Trent. This again shows conclusively, that, Romanists themselves being judges, these controverted doctrines are not necessary to salvation in such sense that a man may not disbelieve them, and, much more, be ignorant of them, without peril to his soul.‡ And as there is no intrinsic necessity in these

\* I am not aware that any sober-minded Romanist pretends to do more than resolve the articles of his new creed into that part of the Apostles' creed, which professes belief in the Holy Catholic Church. But this connection, if admitted, only shows, and is, I believe, only meant to show, that these controverted propositions, when defined by the Church, must be received on her authority. In this case, however, the propositions may be something beside the matter contained in the Apostles' creed, and be held necessary to salvation, not *ex necessitate medii*, so that they cannot be ignored or disbelieved without peril to salvation, but necessary only because the Church enjoins them; which is a different consideration and proceeds upon a different principle.

† See Appendix P.

‡ See Appendix Q.

controverted tenets, so neither is there any such extrinsic evidence of their having been taught by the Apostles as to convict any person who denies them of irreverence or obstinacy. If there were, the early fathers, at least, could not have been ignorant of it without fault: and yet we often find the Romanist excusing even their errors on the ground that they lived before the matters in which he supposes them to err were defined by the Church.

What then is the principle on which their separation proceeds? On what principle is it that these matters are changed from controverted propositions, not into articles of peace, to which it is sufficient that we offer no opposition, but into articles of faith, to be received with firm and unwavering assent as the revelations of God? How is it that matters which are neither necessary in themselves, having no essential connection with the Christian faith, and supported by no such extrinsic evidence as to convince us of their Apostolic origin, have come to be necessary to salvation, as much so as the doctrine contained in the Apostles' creed? The answer is, that these matters are imposed on the consciences of the separatists by an authority to which they think that they and all Christians owe an unquestioning submission; and that, in deference to this authority, they are received without inquiry, without examination, as the undoubted revelations of God: and the authority to which they thus submit is that of the Bishop of Rome. On the 9th day of December, A. D. 1564, the then Bishop of Rome published a bull, in which these controverted propositions were digested into the form of a creed, or rather of a most solemn oath; in which bull he distinctly commands all his subjects to vow, promise, and swear (so

help them (God and the holy gospels!) that they will most constantly retain and confess, entire and inviolate to their latest breath, these propositions of the schools as (equally with the Apostles' creed) the true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved.\*

It is to no purpose to say that the matters contained in this new creed had been previously defined by the Council of Trent. For this council has no pretence to be considered as representing† the Universal Church. It was convoked by the Bishop of Rome, and of course could not be recognized either by the Eastern Churches, or by any other portion of the Church Catholic, which denied his authority to convoke it:

\* Compare with this act of the Bishop of Rome the following decree of the Universal Council of Ephesus, assembled A. D. 431, by the Emperor Theodosius the Younger, to settle the dispute which had been raised in the Church by the doctrines of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople. "These things having been read, the holy Synod has determined that no person shall be allowed to bring forward, or to write, or to compose any other creed besides that which was settled by the holy Fathers, who were assembled in the city of Nicæa, with the Holy Ghost. But those who shall dare to compose any other creed, or to exhibit or produce any such to those who wish to turn to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from Heathenism or Judaism, or any heresy whatever, if they are bishops or clergymen, they shall be deposed, the bishops from their Episcopal office, and the clergymen from the clergy; but if they are of the laity, they shall be anathematized." From this time the creed set forth by the second Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, and which is commonly called the Nicene creed, was held in the utmost veneration by all the Catholic Churches of the East and West. The first addition that was made to it was by Pope Nicholas I., in the ninth century, and consisted in the words *and the Son*, after the word *Father*, in speaking of the procession of the HOLY GHOST. This led to the great schism of the East and West, a schism never to be ended, says our illustrious Bishop Pearson, till those words, *and the Son*, are taken out of the creed. The next addition to this venerable symbol was by Pope Pius IV., A. D. 1564. See Appendix R.

† "Several bishops were for its taking the title of Œcumenical Council representing the Universal Church; but it was at last resolved that they should only take the title of Holy Sacred Œcumenical and Universal Council."—*Dupin's Church Hist.*, vol. iv., p. 74. This, however, was done, though Dupin does not mention the fact, in opposition to the Protestants, who contended that the laity should be admitted to vote

and it consisted of a small number of bishops, chiefly Italians and Spaniards.\* Nor has this council obtained any additional weight of authority by the reception of its decrees; and the reason is, that they were received without examination; for within a year after the council brought its deliberations to a close, its definitions were collected into a creed, and peremptorily enjoined by the court of Rome to be believed without inquiry and examination by all Christians, under peril of damnation. Hence, we are fully authorized to say that these controverted propositions were received as articles of the faith on the principle of obedience to the Bishop of Rome; that very Bishop whom not only the reformed, but even the Roman Catholic bishops of England had declared, in that very age, to have no jurisdiction conferred on him by God in that realm.

Now, when the controversy is brought to this issue, it may soon be terminated. For the Bishop of Rome has no more authority to prescribe articles of faith to the Catholic Church than he has to depose sovereigns from their kingdoms. The assumption of such authority rests on the ground, that the Church of Rome is virtually the Catholic Church, so that they, and only they who take their faith from the See of Rome, are in communion with the Catholic Church. On this principle the greater number of the Apostolic Sees, and the innumerable Christians who are subject to them, are cut off from the body of Christ, and the Catholic Church is limited to a multitude of Christians united under a visible monarchical head at Rome: a notion that might be easily refuted from writers of the Roman

\* The assembly was composed only of a small number of prelates, almost all Italians and Spaniards.—*Dupin's Church Hist.*, vol. iv., p. 72.

communion itself, were it not so vain and extravagant that to espouse it is the sure mark of a weak or distempered mind.\*

In denying that the Bishop of Rome has any jurisdiction given to him by God in these United States of America, (which is the application to our own case, of a principle derived to us from our mother Church, in connection with the faith and sacraments of Christ,) we

\* I have spoken of the Roman schism in England because it is more immediately connected with the subject of my discourse. But in truth the imposition of this new creed as a creed, of these school opinions as *terms of Catholic communion*, makes the Roman Church schismatic in reference to those Protestants in other countries whom she has by this means driven from her communion. For the articles themselves being no part of the essential faith of Christ, and yet being imposed by the Roman Church, not as probable truths for the direction of its own members, but as of the essential faith of Christ, to which every one is bound heartily to assent as to the revelation of God, are *sinful* terms of communion; and consequently the guilt of the schism which they cause rests on the party imposing them. That the adherents of the Roman Church are the more numerous party, is no proof that they are not schismatics. Truth is not determined by plurality of votes, and our faith in the promise of Christ to his Church need not be shaken, though the whole of the *Western* Church should run into schism and heresy.

It is the Church, or rather the Pope and Court of Rome, "which," says Bramhall, "partly by obtruding new creeds and new articles of faith, and especially this doctrine, that it is necessary for every Christian under pain of damnation to be subject to the Bishop of Rome, as the Vicar of Christ, by divine ordination upon earth, (that is, in effect, to be subject to themselves who are his council and officers) yea, even those who, by reason of their remoteness, never heard of the name of Rome, without which it will profit them nothing to have holden the Catholic faith entirely, and partly by their tyrannical and uncharitable censures, have separated all the Asiatic, African, Grecian, Russian and Protestant churches from their communion; not only negatively, in the way of Christian discretion, by withdrawing themselves for fear of infection, but privatively and authoritatively, by way of jurisdiction excluding them (so much as in them lieth) from the communion of Christ; though those churches so chased away by them contain three times more Christian souls than the Church of Rome itself with all its dependents and adherents; many of which do suffer more pressures for the testimony of Christ, than the Romanists do gain advantages, and are ready to shed the last drop of their blood for the least known particle of saving truth; only because they will not strike topsail to the Pope's cross-keys, nor buy indulgences and such like trinkets at Rome. It is not passion, but action, that makes a schismatic; to desert the communion of Christians voluntarily, not to be thrust away from it unwillingly."—*Just. Vind.*, c. 8.

deny also, by necessary implication, that our Lord has appointed a visible head on earth with a power of government over all Christians, or all Churches.\* We reject this theory of a spiritual monarchy for all churches and Christians on earth, because we find no warrant for it in Scripture or antiquity; moreover, we believe that it is as visionary and presumptuous as is the dream of a temporal monarchy for all nations and peoples, and that the attempts to erect the one are as surely productive of schisms and hatred in the Church, as would be the attempts to erect the other of wars and bloodshed in the world. On the other hand, however, we do not regard the Church of Christ as a promiscuous assemblage, nor do we believe that a mere voluntary association, making for itself officers, and compiling for itself a creed out of the Scriptures, and setting up for itself observances in imitation of the Holy Sacraments, becomes thereby a Church of Christ. We believe the Church of Christ to be a continuous body, gathered out of the world, in every age and nation in which it subsists, by a ministry which Christ himself sent (before his ascension into heaven) with a mission capable of perpetuating itself to the end of time; united in a traditionary faith, which this ministry was instructed to guard and transmit; nourished by that Word of God which this ministry was ordained to preach, and bound together in sacraments which this ministry is authorized to dispense. In every country where the Church exists, its members are subject to presbyters, and these presbyters to their bishops, and all particular bishops to the decrees and canons of councils or synods of the whole; which councils or synods are limited in their turn in matters

\* See Appendix S

of faith by Holy Scripture and the creeds of the Catholic Church. No *subordination* beyond this is required by the divine law, and hence no Church of any one country is subordinated, by the law of God, to the Church of any other country. All further union is a union of *co-ordination*, which supposes that the churches of different countries stand on an equal footing; that all are mutually bound to receive and extend to one another the rights and privileges of membership; and that no one Church is justified in erecting its peculiar decrees and customs as terms of Catholic communion. This union of *subordination* in the Church of each particular province or country, and of *co-ordination* among the churches of different and distant countries, was the natural result of the propagation and extension of the Church by messengers who, like the Apostles of our Lord, were clothed with authority, and all with equal authority, flowing from one and the same commission. While these principles of union prevailed, the Holy Church throughout all the world was of one language and one speech; all particular churches were united in the same faith, and the members of the whole, though *scattered abroad*, as God intended, in the east and the west, the north and the south, were yet partakers of the same sacraments. In their present divisions and estrangements they are more like a Babel than the mystical body of Christ; and in their confusion we may read the judgment of God blasting the proud device which has sought to collect and consolidate all churches and all Christians under the government of one local and visible head; *which has taken brick for stone, and slime for mortar, and sought to erect a tower whose top should reach to heaven.*—Genesis xi., 1–9.

It was on this principle of co-ordinate union among equal churches, whose members should be subordinate to their proper local authorities, that the Church of England proceeded in her reformation from popery; and it is in vain to seek to disparage the principle by the epithet of *Anglican*, as if it were a mere local or national device, when we know that the union of the Catholic Church, while it continued one and unbroken, was in fact maintained on this principle; that its most lamentable schisms and divisions have in fact been caused by the arrogant attempts of the Roman papacy to effect union on the opposite principle of a universal monarchy; that the principle is one which in its nature cannot array, and in fact never has arrayed, Christians of any one country in opposition to their civil rulers, by requiring of them a subjection, of any kind whatever, to a local jurisdiction out of their country; that so far as the principle has been acted on, since the time of the reformation from popery, it has been found to be productive of the same advantages which attended it in the ancient Church;\* and finally, that as there is no other obstacle to this principle of co-ordinate union than the antagonistic principle of a monarchical union for the aggrandizement of the court of Rome, so the time may come when the churches in Europe and America, now subject to the Roman Pontiff, may discover the fallacy and pernicious consequences of their fundamental principle of union, and seek to recover and establish Catholic communion among the churches

\* The Church of England, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, may be cited as examples of co-ordinate union at the present time. The liturgies and other formularies of these Churches differ in many points, and some of these points of importance, and yet the pulpits and communion of each are open to the clergy and communicants of the other. In the Church of England I include the churches of Ireland, and of all the British Provinces.

of different countries, on a principle consistent with the ancient and proper local independence of each.\*

That the Church of England proceeded on this principle in her reformation from popery, appears from her own declaration. In the 30th of her "Constitutions and Canons," set forth A. D. 1603, having justified her use of the cross in baptism, by reference of it to the age next succeeding the Apostles', and having remarked "that in process of time the sign of the cross was greatly abused in the Church of *Rome*, especially after the corruption of popery had once possessed it," she adds; "but the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of *England*, to forsake and reject the churches of *Italy, France, Spain, Germany*, or any such like churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the apology for the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men, and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolic Churches which were their first founders."

There are moments and events in the affairs of men, on which depend the destinies of future ages and nations. Such a period is that which we have been considering. What the reformation effected for England we know, for its results are spread out on the page of history; how much greater benefits might have flowed from it had it met with no unnatural obstruction, we know not. What the state of things has been, and still is, in those countries of Europe

\* See Appendix T.

the churches of which have no other notion of communion than that of subjection to a monarchical head at Rome, is before us. What the state of things might have been and might now be in those same countries of Europe, if the churches of those countries had then assumed the same ground with the Church of England, and sought to maintain communion with one another as co-ordinate churches, distinguished indeed by local laws and usages, but united in the faith and sacraments of Christ; what blessings that are now wanting might have been obtained; what evils, religious, political and social, that are now confessed and bewailed, might have been avoided; this can be fully and perfectly known to God alone.

It is with reluctance, brethren, that I have so far departed from my usual course, as to bring before you topics of a polemical nature. You have a right to expect from the pulpit discourses which have a more direct bearing on the faith and duties of the Christian life, and I would not, without reason, disappoint your expectation; but when an event transpires which alarms the weak, and is made an occasion, by designing men, of scattering around them the seeds of distrust and suspicion, I am willing to set before you the grounds which will enable you to estimate such an event at its true value; and, if I am not mistaken, the natural inference from our discourse is, that the unhappy defection,\* to which I have tacitly referred, is a new instance of human weakness and folly; and one which we may distinguish from others only by bestow-

\* The Right Rev. Levi Silliman Ives, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of North Carolina, who, under plea of conscience, has violated the most solemn vows, and deserted a post which he had long seemed unwilling to fill with quietness and unable to maintain with credit. See Appendix U.

ing on it a somewhat larger tribute of pity and compassion.

Never let us cease to regard it as an instance of God's favor and goodness towards us, that in the reformation of our Church from the corruptions of popery, His good Providence hath preserved to us the ancient Apostolical government, and through it a ministry divinely authorized to preach the Word of Christ, and to administer His sacraments. Let us show our gratitude to God for this blessing, by making it our sincere endeavor daily to increase and go forward in the knowledge and faith of God and his Son Jesus Christ, by His Holy Spirit; so that as well by God's ministers as by them to whom they have been appointed ministers, the HOLY NAME of GOD may be always glorified, and His blessed kingdom enlarged, through the same, His SON JESUS CHRIST.



## APPENDIX.

### A.—*Pope B.*

IN the year of our Lord 1521, a consistory was held at Rome, under Leo X., then in the ninth year of his papacy, in which Mr. John Clark, (sometime afterward Bishop of Bath,) orator for Henry VIII. King of England, France, and Ireland, presented to his Holiness, in a set speech, and with many formalities, a treatise which his royal master had composed against MARTIN LUTHER, entitled, “Assertio Septem Sacramentorum;” or, “A Defence of the Seven Sacraments.” The oration of Clark (which is a furious and abusive tirade against Luther) and the response of his Holiness (which is in good taste) are curiosities in their way; but the bull which soon after followed is something more: it is the recorded and still unrevoked judgment of the Church of Rome, whereby, in virtue of her power of benediction, she has, with a bountiful and liberal hand, blessed Henry VIII. and all who should spring from his loins, bestowed on him the title of Defender of the Faith, in order to enable and engage him to use the material sword (which soon after fell on the heads of poor Fisher and Sir Thomas More) for the excision of unsound members of the Church, and forbidden all men to transgress its mandate in the premises under pain of incurring the “indignation of ALMIGHTY God, and — of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul.” We are content to say that Henry VIII. was an instrument and occasion in the hands of God (and such have been many vile and unprincipled men) for the accomplishment of good. Whether he were the monster of lust which he is commonly represented to have been, is a question in which the Reformed Church, as such, has no concern; but whether they who own the Church of Rome for the mother and mistress of all churches can vilify him (however much he may deserve it) without either exposing their souls to danger, or imputing *vanity* and *levity* (see the bull) to the judgment of their said mother and mistress, is a question for their own doctors and casuists to decide. I annex the bull as I find it prefixed to the treatise of Henry VIII. on the Seven Sacraments, (a treatise which is worthy of any modern Pope for its theology, and

rivals Luther himself in invective;) a translation of which was printed in Dublin, 1776.

LEO X., BISHOP,

And Servant of the Servants of God, to our most dear son in Christ, Henry, the illustrious King of England and Defender of the Faith, sends Greeting, and gives his Benedictions.

By the good Pleasure and Will of Almighty God, presiding in the Government of the Universal Church, though unworthy so great charge. We daily employ all our Thoughts, both at home and abroad, for the continual Propagation of the Holy Catholic Faith, without which none can be saved. And that the methods which are taken for repressing such as labor to overthrow the Church, or pervert and stain her by wicked Glosses and malicious Lies, may be carried on with continual Profit, as is ordered by the Sound Doctrine of the Faithful; and especially of such as shine in regal Dignity, We employ with all our Power, our Endeavours, and the Parts of our Ministry.

And as other Roman Bishops, our Predecessors, have been accustomed to bestow some Particular Favours upon Catholic Princes, as the Exigencies of Affairs and Times required, especially on those who, in tempestuous Times, and whilst the rapid Perfidiousness of Schismatics and Heretics raged, not only persevered constantly in the true Faith and unspotted Devotion of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, but also as the Legitimate Sons and stoutest Champions of the same, have opposed themselves, both spiritually and temporally, against the mad Fury of Schismatics and Heretics: So also, We, for your Majesty's most excellent Works, and worthy Actions done for Us, and this Holy See, in which by Divine Permission we preside, do desire to confer upon your Majesty, with Honour and immortal Praises, That, which may enable and engage you carefully to drive away from our Lord's Flock the Wolves, and cut off with the material sword the rotten members that infect the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, and confirm the Hearts of the almost discomfited Faithful in the Solidity of Faith. Truly when our beloved Son, John Clark, your Majesty's Orator, did lately in our Consistory, in Presence of our venerable Brethren, Cardinals of the Sacred Roman Church, and divers others holy Prelates, present unto Us a Book, which your Majesty, moved by your Charity, (which effects every Thing readily and well,) and inflamed with Zeal to the holy Catholic Faith, and Fervour of Devotion towards Us, and this Holy See; did compose, as a most noble and wholesome Antidote against the Errors of divers Heretics, often condemned by this Holy See, and now again revived by Martin Luther: When, I say, he offered this Book to Us, to be examined, and approved by Our Authority; and also declared, in a very eloquent Discourse, That, as your Majesty, had by true Reasons, and the undeniable Authority of Scripture and holy Fathers, confuted the notorious Errors of Luther; so you are likewise ready, and resolved to prosecute, with all the Forces of your

Kingdom, those who shall presume to follow, or defend them ; having found in this Book most admirable Doctrine, sprinkled with the Dew of Divine Grace ; We rendered infinite thanks to Almighty God, from whom every good Thing, and every perfect gift proceeds, for being pleased to fill with his Grace, and to inspire your most excellent Mind, inclined for all Good, to defend, by your Writings, his Holy Faith, against the new Broacher of these condemned Errors ; and to unite all other Christians, by your Example, to assist and favour, with all their Power, the Orthodox Faith, and évangélical Truth, now under so great Peril and Danger.

Considering that it is but just, that those who undertake pious Labours, in defence of the Faith of Christ, should be extolled with all Praise and Honour ; and being willing, not only to magnify with deserved Praise, and approve with our Authority, what your Majesty has with Learning and Eloquence writ against Luther ; but also to honour your Majesty with such a Title, as shall give all Christians to understand, as well in our Times, as in succeeding Ages, how acceptable and welcome your Gift was to Us, especially in this juncture of Time : We, the true successor of St. Peter, (whom Christ, before his Ascension, left as his Vicar upon Earth, and to whom he committed the Care of his Flock,) presiding in this Holy See, from whence all Dignity and Titles have their Source ; have with our Brethren maturely deliberated upon these Things ; and with one consent unanimously decreed to bestow on your Majesty this Title, viz : Defender of the Faith. And, as we have by this Title honoured you ; we likewise command all Christians, that they name your Majesty by this Title ; and that in their Writings to your Majesty, immediately after the word King, they add, Defender of the Faith.

Having thus weighed, and diligently considered your singular Merits, we could not have invented a more congruous name, nor more worthy your Majesty, than this worthy and most excellent Title ; which, as often as you hear, or read, you shall remember your own merits and virtues : Nor will you, by this Title, exalt yourself, or become proud, but, according to your accustomed Prudence, rather more humble in the Faith of Christ ; and more strong and constant in your Devotion to this Holy See, by which you were exalted. And you shall rejoice in our Lord, who is the Giver of all Good Things, for leaving such a perpetual and everlasting monument of your Glory to Posterity, and showing the Way to others, that if they also covet to be invested with such a Title, they may study to do such Actions, and to follow the Steps of your most excellent Majesty ; Whom, with your wife, children, and all who shall spring from you, We bless with a bountiful and liberal Hand ; in the Name of Him from whom the Power of Benediction is given to Us, and by whom Kings reign, and Princes govern ; and in whose Hands are the Hearts of Kings :

Praying, and beseeching the most High, to confirm your Majesty in your holy Purposes, and to augment your Devotion ; and for your most excellent Deeds in Defence of his Holy Faith, to render your Majesty so illustrious and famous to the whole World, as that our

Judgment in adorning you with so remarkable a Title, may not be thought vain, or light, by any Person whatsoever; and finally, after you have finished your course in this Life, that he may make you Partaker of his eternal Glory. It shall not be Lawful for any Person whatsoever, to infringe, or by any rash Presumption to act contrary to This Letter of our Subscribing, and Command. But, if any one shall presume to make such Attempt; let him Know that he shall thereby incur the Indignation of Almighty God, and of the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, the fifth of the Ides of October; in the year of our Lord's Incarnation 1521, and in the ninth year of our papacy.

---

B.—Page 3.

THE question was propounded at that time in consequence of a "dispensation" from Rome. For Arthur, the eldest son of Henry VII., had married Catharine, daughter of Ferdinand, King of Spain, and died about five months after the marriage. In order to retain her dowry in England, Henry VII. proposed to Ferdinand a contract of marriage between Catharine and his second son, afterwards Henry VIII. The proposition was acceptable to Ferdinand, but unfortunately the marriage of a brother's wife was forbidden, *totidem verbis*, in Leviticus xviii., 16. To remove the obstacle recourse was had to the then Pope of Rome, Julius II., who granted a bull, in which he says, "We, by apostolical authority, do give you by these presents our dispensation to contract a marriage between you by lawful words in the present tense, and after such contract (even though it be already made) lawfully to remain in the same," &c. In virtue of this license and dispensation the contract was made, though the marriage (for Henry, at the time of the contract, was but a boy of twelve years) was not solemnized until after the death of Henry VII.

The question of the lawfulness of the marriage was not mooted until some twenty years afterwards, when a marriage was proposed between Mary (the only child of Henry and Catharine who lived to adult years) and the Duke of Orleans, the second son of Francis I. "Before we treat of such marriage," said one of the councillors of the French king, "we must first inquire whether the Lady Mary be King Henry's lawful daughter. Because she was born of the Lady Catherine, his brother's widow, which kind of marriages are contrary to the laws of God." See Mason, (Lindsay's, p. 126, with the author-

ities there adduced,) who adds: "This scruple concerning that marriage being incestuous was first raised in the King of Spain's court, from whence it spread itself into France and Flanders."

Instigated by the machinations of Cardinal Wolsey, (who had his own ends to answer,) Henry VIII. afterwards applied to the then Pope, Clement VII., to declare his marriage with Catherine invalid; and Clement, as we learn from his private secretary, the famous historian, Guicciardini, secretly made (and gave in charge to Cardinal Campegio) a bull decretal, annulling the dispensation of Pope Julius, and pronouncing the marriage to be of no force. *See the passage of Guicciardini, in Lindsay's Mason, as above.*

Wearied with the delays and evasions of the Papal Court, (for the contingency on which the use of the decretal depended did not arise,) and desirous—so at least he professed—to have the matter settled one way or the other for the satisfaction of his own conscience, Henry finally submitted the question to the convocation of the clergy of his kingdom, who decided (by a vote of 253 to 19) that the marriage, being prohibited by the law of God, was not within the dispensation of the Pope. "In this same convocation," adds Mr. Lindsay, in his preface to *Mason*, "the last under Archbishop Warham, the Pope's Supremacy began to be warmly disputed, though they came to no resolution at present; but soon after, in Cranmer's time, they did come to a resolution, in both Provinces, that by the Word of God the Pope has no more jurisdiction in England than any foreign bishop; wherein it is remarkable, that, in the province of Canterbury, only four of the lower house voted for the Pope's authority, and one demurred. To which I may add, that about the same time, (to wit, 1534,) Edward Lee, Archbishop of York, John Stokesly, Bishop of London, Cuthbert Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, made severally their solemn and voluntary profession and promise, in writing, under their respective hands and seals, and in the faith of bishops, declaring (amongst other things) that the Papacy of Rome is not ordained of God by holy Scripture, but set up only by man; and that the Bishop of Rome is not to be called Pope, nor Supreme Bishop, or Universal Bishop, nor Most Holy Lord, but only ought to be called Bishop of Rome, and Fellow-Brother, as the old manner of the most ancient bishops hath been, &c.

"The University of Cambridge, by a public and solemn Instrument under their common seal, did, in the same year, determine and declare, 'that the Bishop of Rome hath no more state, authority, and jurisdiction given him of God in the Scriptures, over this realm of

England, than any other externe bishop hath.' That the same Bishop Gardiner, (to say nothing of a Latin apology, supposed to be written by him, by way of justification of the king's conduct, in answer to the Pope's extravagant bull,\*) in his book, intituled, "*De Verâ Obedientiâ*," did not only solidly and deliberately confute the Pope's said usurped authority, but also proved the said marriage between the king and Queen Catherine not to be good nor lawful. To which book of Gardiner's, Edmund Bonner (afterwards Bishop of London) prefixed a preface full of commendations, enforcing the same arguments, and treating the Pope with rough language: yea, and the same Bishop Gardiner (as a person of honour tells us) declared, moreover, that the king was bound in conscience to reform his Church. That the same Bishop Tunstal, in a sermon preached about the same time before the king, on Palm-Sunday, proved, by manifest grounds, out of the Scripture, the Fathers, and Councils, that the Bishop of Rome hath no such authority by the Word of God committed to him as he doth challenge, and treated both Cardinal Pole and the Pope himself with great freedom of speech. That, besides the said sermon, the same Bishop Tunstal did join with John Stokesley, Bishop of London, in writing a letter to the said Cardinal, wherein they clearly prove that the Bishop of Rome hath no special superiority over other bishops, &c. That John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, in a sermon on Good-Friday, 1538, before the king, at Greenwich, did zealously preach on the king's behalf against the Pope's usurped supremacy." For a fuller statement of this matter see next note.

---

C.—Page 4.

As the right of the Bishop of Rome to jurisdiction in England is the hinge upon which the whole controversy with the Romanists turns, it will be satisfactory to the reader to see some of the proofs of the unanimity with which that right was denied, when the question was first propounded, and while yet the Church of England was in communion with the see of Rome.

In the first place, I adduce the declaration of the learned Mr. Wharton (as quoted by Collier,) in his *Observations on Strype's Cranmer*, who says, "that the renunciation of the Pope by the clergy

\* Reference is made to the bull of Paul III., excommunicating and deposing Henry VIII. See M. M.

and the religions was general; that the originals are still remaining in the Exchequer; that he had in his custody no less than a hundred seventy and five such authentic instruments, transcribed from thence; that these transcripts contain the subscriptions of all the bishops, chapters, monasteries, colleges, hospitals, etc., of thirteen dioceses, and that, to his certain knowledge, the original subscriptions of the remaining dioceses were lodged elsewhere."

In the convocation of the province of Canterbury, the question being put by Archbishop Cranmer, both houses came to a resolution that the Pope had no greater jurisdiction, etc., than any other foreign bishop. In the lower house, four voted for the Pope's authority, and one demurred. At the same time an instrument, or declaration of the sense of the prelates and clergy of the province of Canterbury was drawn and signed with this title,—*Quod Romanus Episcopus non habet majorem jurisdictionem sibi a Deo collatam, in hoc regno, quam alius quivis externus Episcopus.* See Collier's Eccle. Hist. fol. ed., vol. ii., p. 94, who refers to "Journal of Convoc., fol. 59."

For the satisfaction of the English reader I translate the instrument, which declares the judgment of the Convocation of the province of York, the original of which is No. 26 of Collier's Records:—

*The Judgment of the Convocation of the Province of York, rejecting the Pope's Authority.*

To the most illustrious and excellent Prince and Lord Henry VIII., by the grace of God King of England and France, Defender of the Faith, and Lord of Ireland, Edward, by divine permission, Archbishop of York, Primate and Metropolitan of England, in Him, through whom kings reign and princes rule, Greeting:

We do your Royal Highness to wit, by tenor of these presents, that, according to the mandate of your Royal Majesty, before the Bishops and Clergy of York, in a holy Provincial Synod of the Province, or convocation of the Bishops and Clergy of the same province of York, held in the capitular house of the Metropolitan Church, at York, on the fifth day of the month of May, in the year of our Lord MDXXXIV., now current, and continued from day to day, the following conclusion was proposed, viz., That the Bishop of Rome, in the Holy Scriptures, has not any greater jurisdiction in the realm of England than any other foreign bishop. And, moreover, on the part of those deputed by us to preside in the same synod, the Bishops and Clergy were admonished, asked, and required to confirm and corroborate said conclusion with their own consent, if they should think and judge the same consonant to truth and not repugnant to the Holy Scriptures. At length, the said Bishops and Clergy of the Province of York aforesaid, after diligent entreatment of the same, and mature deliberation, unanimously and concordantly, none of them dissenting, affirmed the aforesaid conclusion to have been and to be true, and with one mind consented to the same.

The which, all and singular, and by tenor of these presents, we declare and signify to your Royal Highness.

In proof and testimony of which, all and singular, we have caused our seal hereto to be put.

Done at our Manor of Camodd, on the first day of June, A. D. MDXXXIV., and in the third year of our consecration.

The judgment of the University of Oxford shows the care and labor with which the question was considered, and the solicitude that was felt to preserve the honor of the University. The English reader, I hope, will not be displeased if I translate this also, referring to No. 27 of Collier's Records for the Latin :—

To all the sons of Holy Mother Church, to whom these presents may come, John, by divine permission, Bishop of Lincoln, Chancellor of the University of Oxford ; also, the whole Assembly of Doctors and Masters in the same, Regent and non-Regent, in Christ, Greeting :

Whereas our most illustrious and mighty Prince and Lord, Henry VIII., by the grace of God, King of England and France, Defender of the Faith, and Lord of Ireland, in consequence of the earnest petitions and complaints of his subjects, in Parliament, against some intolerable foreign exactions, and of some controversies in relation to the power and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, and of various and urgent causes, then and there declared against the same Bishop, has been approached and solicited to consult in this matter for the good of his subjects, and to satisfy their complaints ; and whereas he himself, like the wise king of Israel, having a watchful care for the interests of his subjects in this realm, and profoundly considering in what manner he may establish the best laws for his realm, and cautious, above all, that he may decree nothing against Holy Scripture (which he ever hath been and will be most ready to defend, even to death,) has, of his own mind and care, publicly and solemnly transmitted to this Academy of Oxford the following question, to be disputed by its Doctors and Masters ; viz., *Whether the Bishop of Rome have any greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in Holy Scripture in this realm of England than any other foreign Bishop?* and hath commanded that, after mature deliberation and diligent examination had on this question, we certify, under the common seal of the University, in due form and solemnity, what, in our judgment, the Holy Scriptures decree on this subject :

“ We, therefore, the Chancellor, Doctors and Masters aforesaid, often remembering and deeply sensible how virtuous and holy a thing it is, how consonant to our profession, and due to submission, obedience, and reverence, and how congruous to charity, to show plainly the way of Righteousness and Truth to as many as desire to walk in the footsteps of the Holy Scriptures, and with secure and quiet conscience to stay their anchor on the Law of God, could spare no vigilance that in so just and honorable an application, and to so great a Prince, (under whose auspices we are bound to obey the Su-

preme Ruler,) we might give all the satisfaction in our power. Accordingly, after having received the aforesaid question, with all humility, devotion and due reverence, the Divines of our Academy being convoked from all parts, the space of many days being taken, and a sufficiently ample time for deliberation, during which, with all the diligence in our power, with zeal for justice, with religion and with conscience uncorrupt, we thoroughly examined as well the books of Holy Scripture, as the most approved interpreters of the same, often and often consulting them, most accurately collating and repeatedly examining them, and moreover, after solemn disputations openly and publicly held and celebrated, have at length all come unanimously to this opinion and have consented in the same; viz.: That the Bishop of Rome has not any greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in Holy Scripture, in this realm of England, than any other foreign Bishop.

And this, our assertion, opinion or determination, thus deliberately discussed and concluded by us, according to the requirement of the statutes and ordinances of this our University; we do publicly, in the name of the whole Academy, by these presents, affirm and attest as true, certain, and consonant to Holy Scripture.

In proof and testimony of which, all and singular, we have caused these letters to be executed, and confirmed by the common seal of our University.

Done in our House of Convocation, on the 27th day of June, and in the year of our Lord's nativity MDXXXIV.

Next, I adduce the following passage from "The Institution of a Christian Man," published in 1537, and commonly called the Bishop's Book. The preface is signed by twenty-one, *i. e.*, by all the Bishops, by eight Archdeacons, (Bonner included, who was then Archdeacon of Leicester,) and by seventeen of the other clergy. The extract is taken from the chapter "On the Sacrament of Orders," pp. 116—119 of Oxford ed., 1825.

Finally, being thus declared, not only what is the virtue and efficacy, with the whole institution and use of the sacrament of holy orders, but also in what things consisteth the power and jurisdiction of priests and bishops, and unto what limits the same is extended by the authority of the gospel, and also what is added thereunto by the grants and sufferances, or permission of kings and princes; we think it convenient, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge, that whereas certain men do imagine and affirm, that Christ should give unto the Bishop of Rome power and authority, not only to be head and governor of all priests and bishops in Christ's Church, but also to have and occupy the whole monarchy of the world in his hands, and that he may thereby lawfully depose kings and princes from their realms, dominions and seigniories, and so transfer and give the same to such persons as him liketh; that is utterly false and untrue; for Christ never gave unto St. Peter, or unto any of the Apostles, or

their successors, any such authority. And the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul do teach and command that all Christian people, as well priests and bishops, as others, should be obedient and subject unto the princes and potentates of the world, although they were infidels. And as for the Bishop of Rome, it was many hundred years after Christ before he could acquire or get any primacy or governance above any other bishops out of his province in Italy. Sith the which time he hath ever usurped more and more. And though some part of his power was given unto him by the consent of the emperors, kings and princes, and by the consent also of the clergy in general councils assembled; yet surely he attained the most part thereof by marvellous subtilty and craft, and specially by coluding with great kings and princes; sometimes training them into his devotion by pretence and color of holiness and sanctimony, and sometimes constraining them by force and tyranny; whereby the said Bishops of Rome aspired and arose at length unto such greatness in strength and authority, that they presumed and took upon them to be heads, and to put laws by their own authority, not only unto all other bishops within Christendom, but also unto the emperors, kings, and other princes and lords of the world, and that under the pretence of the authority committed unto them by the gospel; wherein the said Bishops of Rome do not only abuse and pervert the true sense and meaning of Christ's word, but they do also clean contrary to the use and custom of the primitive Church, and also do manifestly violate as well the holy canons made in the Church immediately after the time of the apostles, as also the decrees and constitutions made in that behalf by the holy fathers of the Catholic Church, assembled in the first general councils;\* and finally they do

\* In connection with this statement the reader may peruse the following canons, which I transcribe from Hammond's "Canons of the Church :"

*Apostolical Canons, No. 34.*—The bishops of every nation must acknowledge him who is first among them; and account him as their head, and do nothing of consequence without his consent; but each may do those things which concern his own Parish and the country places which belong to it. But neither let him [who is the first] do anything without the consent of all; for so there will be unanimity, and God will be glorified through the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Father through the Lord by the Holy Spirit, even to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

*Council of Nice, Canon 4.*—It is most proper that a bishop should be constituted by all the bishops of the province; but if this be difficult on account of some urgent necessity, or the length of the way, that at all events *three* should meet at the same place, those who are absent also giving their suffrages, and their consent in writing, and then the ordination be performed. The confirming, however, of what is done in each province, belongs to the metropolitan of it.

*Canon 6.*—Let the ancient customs be maintained which are in Egypt and Lybia, and Pentapolis, according to which the Bishop of Alexandria has authority over all those places. For this is also customary to the Bishop of Rome. In like manner in Antioch, and in the other Provinces, the privileges are to be preserved to the Churches. But this is clearly to be understood, that if any one

transgress their own profession, made in their creation. For all the Bishops of Rome always, when they be consecrated and made

be made a bishop without the consent of the metropolitan, the great synod declares that he shall not be a bishop. If, however, two or three bishops, shall, from private contention, oppose the common choice of all the others, it being a reasonable one, and made according to the ecclesiastical canons, let the choice of the majority hold good.

*Council of Antioch, Canon 9.*—It behooves the bishops in every province to own him who presides over the metropolis, and who is to take care of the whole province: because all who have business come together from every side to the metropolis. Wherefore, also, it has been decreed, that he should have a precedence of rank, and that the other bishops should do nothing of consequence without him, according to the ancient canon which we have received from our fathers; or, at any rate, only those things which belong to each particular parish, and the districts which are under it. For each bishop is to have authority over his own parish, and to administer it with that piety which concerns every one, and to make provision for all the district which is under his city, to ordain presbyters and deacons, and to determine everything with judgment; but let him attempt to do nothing further without the bishop of the metropolis, and let him not do anything without the consent of the others.

*Council of Constantinople, Canon 2.*—The bishops must not go beyond their dioceses, and enter upon churches without their borders, nor bring confusion into their churches; but, according to the canons, the Bishop of Alexandria must have the sole administration of the affairs of Egypt, and the Bishops of the East must administer the East only, the privileges which were assigned to the Church of Antioch by the canons made at Nice being preserved; and the bishops of the Asian diocese must administer the affairs of the Asian only; and those of the Pontic diocese, the affairs of the Pontic only; and those of Thrace, the affairs of Thrace only. Moreover, bishops may not, without being called, go beyond the bounds of their diocese for the purpose of ordaining, or any other ecclesiastical function. The above written canon respecting the dioceses being observed, it is plain that the synod of each Province must administer the affairs of the Province, according to what was decreed at Nice. But the churches of God which are amongst the barbarians, must be administered according to the customs of the Fathers which have prevailed.

*Council of Ephesus, Canon 8.*—The most beloved of God, and our fellow Bishop Reginus, and Zeno, and Evagrius, the most religious bishops of the Province of Cyprus, who were with him, have declared unto us an innovation which has been introduced contrary to the laws of the Church, and the canons of the Holy Fathers, and which affects the liberty of all. Wherefore, since evils which affect the community require more attention, inasmuch as they cause greater hurt; and especially since the Bishop of Antioch has not so much as followed an ancient custom, in performing ordination in Cyprus, as those most religious persons who have come to the Holy Synod have informed us, by writing and by word of mouth, we declare that they who preside over the Holy Churches which are in Cyprus, shall preserve, without gainsaying or opposition, their right of performing by themselves the ordinations of the most religious bishops, according to the canons of the Holy Fathers and the ancient

bishops of that See, do make a solemn profession and vow,\* that they shall inviolably keep and observe all the ordinances made in the eight first general councils, among the which it is specially provided and enacted, that all causes shall be finished and determined within

customs. The same rule shall be observed in all the other dioceses and in the provinces everywhere, so that none of the most religious bishops shall invade any other province, which has not heretofore from the beginning been under the hand of himself or his predecessors. But if any one has so invaded a province, and brought it by force under himself, he shall restore it, that the canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed, nor the pride of secular dominion be privily introduced under the appearance of a sacred office, nor we lose by little, the freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has given us by his own blood. The Holy and Œcumenical Synod has therefore decreed that the rights which have heretofore and from the beginning belonged to each Province, shall be preserved to it pure and without restraint, according to the custom which has prevailed of old: each metropolitan having permission to take a copy of the things now transacted for his own security. But if any one shall introduce any regulation contrary to what has been defined, the whole Holy and Œcumenical Synod has decreed that it shall be of no effect.

*Council of Chalcedon, Canon 28.*—We, following in all things the decisions of the Holy Fathers, and acknowledging the canon of the one hundred and fifty most religious bishops which has just been read, do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most holy city of Constantinople, New Rome. For the Fathers properly gave the primacy to the throne of the elder Rome, because that was the imperial city. And the one hundred and fifty most religious bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome, judging, with reason, that the city which was honored with the sovereignty and senate, and which enjoyed equal privileges with the elder royal Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second after her. And [we also decree] that the metropolitans only of the Pontic, and Asian, and Thracian dioceses, and moreover the bishops of the aforesaid dioceses who are amongst the barbarians, shall be ordained by the above-mentioned most holy throne of the most holy church of Constantinople; each metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses ordaining the bishops of the Province, as has been declared by the divine canons; but the metropolitans themselves of the said dioceses, shall, as has been said, be ordained by the Bishop of Constantinople, the proper elections been made according to custom, and reported to him.

\* The vow or profession referred to, may be seen in Gratian's *CORPUS JURIS CANONICI*, *Distinctio XVI.*, caput 8., ed. Colonix Munatiane, 1730.

*Auctoritate Romani Pontificis sancta octo consilia roborantur.*

Sancta octo universalia concilia, id est primum Nicænum, secundum Constantinopolitanum, tertium Ephesinum, quartum Chalcedonense, item quintum Constantinopolitanum et sextum, item Nicænum septimum, octavum quoque Constantinopolitanum, usque ad unum apicem immutilata servare, et pari honore et veneratione digna habere, et quæ prædicaverunt et statuerunt modis omnibus sequi et prædicare, quaque condemnaverunt ore et corde condemnare prohibetur.

the province where the same be begun, and that by the bishops of the same province; and that no bishops shall exercise any jurisdiction over kings and bishops as the Bishops of Rome pretend now to have over the same. And we find that divers good fathers, Bishops of Rome, did greatly reprove, yea, and abhor, (as a thing clean contrary to the gospel, and the decrees of the Church,) that any Bishop of Rome, or elsewhere, should presume, usurp, or take upon him the title or name of the universal bishop, or of the head of all priests, or of the highest priest, or any such like title. For confirmation whereof, it is out of all doubt, that there is no mention made, neither in Scripture, neither in the writings of any authentical doctor, or author of the Church, being within the time of the apostles, that Christ did ever make or institute any distinction or difference to be in the pre-eminence of power, order or jurisdiction, between the apostles themselves, or between the bishops themselves; but that they were all equal in power, order, authority and jurisdiction. And that there is now, and sith the time of the apostles, any such diversity of or difference among the bishops, it was devised by the ancient fathers of the primitive Church, for the conservation of good order and unity of the Catholic Church; and either by the consent and authority, or else at least by the permission and sufferance of the princes and civil powers for the time ruling. For the said fathers, considering the great and infinite multitude of Christian men, so largely increased through the world, and taking examples of the Old Testament, thought it expedient to make an order of degrees, to be among bishops and spiritual governors of the Church; and so ordained some to be patriarchs, some to be primates, some to be metropolitans, some to be archbishops, some to be bishops. And to them did limit severally, not only their certain dioceses or provinces, wherein they should exercise their power, and not exceed the same, but also certain bounds and limits of their jurisdiction and power. Insomuch, that whereas in the time of the apostles it was lawful indifferently to all bishops (certain of them assembling themselves together) to constitute and consecrate other bishops; the said fathers restrained the said power, and reserved the same in such wise, that without the consent and authority of the metropolitan or archbishop, no bishop could be consecrated within any province. And likewise in other cases their powers were also restrained, for such causes as were then thought unto them convenient. Which differences the said holy fathers thought necessary to enact and establish, by their decrees and constitutions, not for that any such differences were prescribed or established in the gospel, or mentioned in any canonical writings of the apostles, or testified by any ecclesiastical writer within the apostles' time; but to the intent that thereby contention, strife, variance,

That is—The Holy Eight Universal Councils, viz. :—the first of Nice, etc., I promise to keep whole and inviolate in every point, and to hold worthy of equal honor and veneration; to follow and declare by every means what they have declared or ordained, and to condemn with mouth and heart what they have condemned.

and schisms or division, should be avoided, and the Church should be preserved in good order and concord.

I will trouble the reader with but one more extract, and it shall be the united testimony of the inseparable Gardiner and Bonner. For on the publication of Paul III.'s bull, excommunicating and deposing Henry VIII., Gardiner, in a work entitled "Of True Obedience," came out manfully in defence of his sovereign, to whom, by the way, he was, as Bramhall tells us, a "very near relation:" (on which the editor of Bramhall notes: "Gardiner is said (see Biogr. Brit. art. Gardiner, note B.) to have been the illegitimate son of a Dr. Woodvill, Bishop of Salisbury, who was brother to Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV., and grandmother of Henry VIII.") The work "Of True Obedience" was first published in London in 1534-35, and again in 1536 at Hamburg, with a preface by Bonner. In this work Gardiner says: "No foreign bishop hath authority among us. \* \* \* ALL SORTS OF PEOPLE ARE AGREED WITH US UPON THIS POINT WITH MOST STEADFAST CONSENT, THAT NO MANNER OF PERSON BRED OR BROUGHT UP IN ENGLAND HATH AUGHT TO DO WITH THEM."

I give the quotation as I find it in Bramhall's Works, vol. i, p. 121, of the Oxford edition of 1842; the learned editor of which informs us in a note, that the passages quoted by Bramhall, from Gardiner's book, are in pp. 812, 817, of the reprint of it (with Bonner's preface) in Brown's appendix to Gratius, Fascicul. Rer. Expend, et Fugiend. London, 1690." It is needless to refer to Tostall, Longland, (see the extract from Lindsay in the previous note) and Bekenshaw, Roman Catholics of that age, who have left testimonies to the same effect. For the above citations and references make it certain, at least to my mind, that the Pope's supremacy was rejected in England, not (as the Romanists pretend) under fear of a *Premunire*, but from a deep conviction and long experience of its evils, and with the hearty and unanimous consent of all ranks and classes of men in the kingdom.

If my subject required me to extend my remarks to the estimation in which the Bishop of Rome was, at that time, held in Ireland, the following extract from Bramhall (who was born in the reign of Elizabeth, and was at the time of his death Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland) might furnish a text for an instructive discourse:

"And to shew yet further, that Ireland was unanimous herein with England, we find in the three and thirtieth year of Henry the Eighth, which was before all thoughts of reformation, not the Irish only, as the O'Neals, O'Reillys, O'Briens, O'Carrols, &c., but also the English families, as the Desmonds, Barries, Roches, Bourkes, whose pos-

terities do still continue zealous Romanists, did make their submissions by indenture to Sir Anthony Sellenger, then chief governor of that kingdom, wherein they 'acknowledged King Henry to be their sovereign lord, and confessed the king's supremacy in all causes, and utterly renounced the jurisdiction of the Pope.' So the Bishop of Winchester might well say, that there was an universal and steadfast consent in the separation from Rome." (Bram. vol. i., p. 122.)

---

#### D.—Page 5.

In all this, if we except the *word* "Head" of the Church, as applied to the King, there was really nothing new. The Kings of England, from time immemorial, had been called the Protectors and Tutors (Guardians) of the Church; and the statute (26 Henry VIII.) which empowered the King to redress and reform abuses, was not introductory of a new law, but declaratory of the old law of the Kingdom. "Our Kings," says Sir Roger Twisden, "were originally endued with authority to cause the English Church to be reformed by the advice of their Bishops, and other of the Clergy, as agreeing with the practice of all ages. For who introduced the opinion of Transubstantiation? made it an article of Faith? barred the Lay of the Cup? Priests of marriage? who restored the Mass in Queen Mary's days, before any reconciliation made with Rome?—but the Ecclesiastics of this Kingdom under the Prince for the time being, who commanded or connived at it." And if the King and Parliament, with the advice and consent of the Bishops and Clergy, *restored* the Cup to the Laity and enacted other reforms by law, where was the departure from ancient usage? The particular acts, indeed, were of a different nature, but the principle of procedure was the same. And yet these proceedings drew from Paul III., the then Bishop of Rome, one of the most furious bulls that ever issued from the Vatican. In this bull (for a further account of which see Appendix MM.) the Pope denounces Henry as a heretic and schismatic, because he had denied the Bishop of Rome to be the Head of the Church and Vicar of Christ, and declared himself to be the Head of the Church. The King, however, as Twisden remarks, had simply done neither the one nor the other. He had not denied that the Pope was the Head of the Church in his own dominions, nor in France, Spain, or any other country that chose to acknowledge him in that character. He had simply denied (and that with the consent and

approbation of the Roman Catholic Bishops and Clergy of his Kingdom,) that the Pope was the Head of the Church throughout all the world, and consequently in the realm of England. He had not denied the Pope to be the Vicar of CHRIST in his own diocese—for such, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, are all bishops in their respective dioceses. Neither had he declared himself to be the Head of the Church of England in such a sense as to be the source of any *merely* spiritual jurisdiction, but only in such a sense as to be the source (exclusively of all foreign power) of all *outward and coercive* jurisdiction in the realm of England.

To perceive the necessity of denying this SUPREMACY to the Bishop of Rome and of restoring it to the crown, (or to the people, as we would say, if the government of England had been of the republican and not of the monarchical kind,) it is proper to advert to the theory of the Roman divines on the relation of the spiritual and temporal powers. “The temporal power,” says one of the ablest and most guarded of their number, “has its princes, its laws and its judgments; and the spiritual power in like manner has its bishops, its canons and its judgments. The end proposed by the former is temporal peace; the end proposed by the latter is everlasting salvation. Sometimes these powers are found separate, as formerly in the age of the apostles; and at other times, as now, they are found conjoined. When the spiritual and temporal powers are conjoined, they make one body, and ought therefore to be connected, and the inferior subjected and subordinated to the superior. And so the spiritual does not mix itself with temporal affairs, but suffers them all to proceed as they did before they were conjoined, provided they do not obstruct the end of the spiritual power or are not necessary for the attainment of this end. But if any such thing happen, *the spiritual power can and ought to coerce the temporal by every way and means which shall seem necessary to its end.*”\*

From this moderate theory (for moderate it is in comparison with

\* Ita prorsus politica potestas habet suos principes, leges, judicia, &c., et similiter Ecclesiastica suos Episcopos, canones, judicia. Illa habet pro fine, temporalem pacem, ista salutem æternam. Inveniuntur quandoque separatæ, ut olim tempore Apostolorum, quandoque conjunctæ, ut nunc. Quando autem sunt conjunctæ unum corpus efficiunt, ideoque debent esse connexæ, et inferior superiori subjecta et subordinata. Itaque spiritualis non se miscet temporalibus negotiis, sed sinit omnia procedere, sicut antequam essent conjunctæ, dummodo non obsint fini spirituali aut non sint necessaria ad eum consequendum. Si autem tale quid accidat, spiritualis potestas potest et debet coercere temporalem omni ratione, ac via, quæ ad id necessaria esse videbitur.—*Bellar. de Romano. Pont. Lib. V., C. 7.*

the extravagant theories of the canonists) the reader may easily conjecture the state of the English nation while it acknowledged its subjection to a spiritual coercive power, the source and fountain of which was at Rome. The results of this unnatural relation are thus summed up by Bramhall, who has adduced a mass of facts to show that these and not the imperious temper of Henry VIII. were the real grounds of renouncing the papal supremacy in England.

“First. The most intolerable extortions of the Roman Court, committed from age to age without hope of remedy.

“Secondly. Their most unjust usurpations of all rights, civil, ecclesiastical, sacred and profane, of all orders of men, kings, nobles, bishops, &c.

“Thirdly. The malignant influence and effects of this foreign jurisdiction, destructive to the right ends of ecclesiastical discipline, producing disunion in the realm, factions and animosities between the crown and the mitre, intestine discords between the king and his barons, bad intelligence with neighbor princes, and foreign wars.

“Fourthly. A list of other inconveniences, or rather mischiefs, that did flow from thence; as, to be daily subject to have new articles of Faith obtruded upon them, to be exposed to manifest peril of idolatry, to forsake the communion of three parts of Christendom, to approve the Pope’s rebellion against general councils, and to have their bishops take an oath—contrary to their oath of allegiance—to maintain the Pope in his rebellious usurpations.”

One unhappy effect of the extravagant claims, before the Reformation, in behalf of the spiritual power, was to beget a reaction afterwards towards the opposite extreme. Hence the Hobbian, or, as it is more commonly called (*euphoniae gratia*, I suppose, for the infidel of Malmesbury was its sturdiest patron, and his name fits it better than that of the German physician), the Erastian theory; which regards the Church as the mere creature of the state. It must be confessed that this theory, though it has never had the effect to deprive the Church of its spiritual powers, has yet had a disastrous influence. It has choked the true principles of the Church as maintained from the Reformation to the Revolution; it has fostered a distrust and jealousy of all who assert her divine constitution as a body politic originally distinct from the state; and it has shown itself in a relentless determination to keep her down to the rigorous letter of laws, (originally enacted for her protection as well as the state’s against the evils of a foreign jurisdiction,) which, though they leave unimpaired her spiritual powers, so cripple her in the use of these powers.

as to render them inoperative in some important matters of exterior jurisdiction.

The theory of the Church of England divines on this subject, if I rightly understand it, is simple. They regard the state and the Church as two separate and concurring bodies, each capable of preserving its own continuity, and of existing independently the one on the other, but both uniting and helping each other in the attainment of their respective ends. The jurisdiction of the Church they understand to be *merely* spiritual, operating outwardly, indeed, (unless for wise ends restrained by the state,) in synods, judicatories, canons, &c., but wholly debarred, by its divine constitution, from all attempts to give effect to its decisions and enactments by any other than *merely* spiritual censures or penalties. All coercive jurisdiction even in spiritual matters and over spiritual persons they refer exclusively to the state. The Church, they say, may make *canons* and press them on the consciences of her members; but only the state can make *laws* and guard them by compulsory penalties. Thus distinct and yet concurrent, they tell us, were Church and state under Constantine, and for several hundred years afterwards; and the denial of the papal supremacy, and the expulsion of the canon law from England, was a return of the two bodies to their former relations; the Church, i. e., the persons and goods of its members, becoming subject in all things (saving faith and a good conscience) to the temporal and coercive power of the state, and so rendering unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and the state conceding all *merely* spiritual power to the Church, keeping her in the exercise of it to the great ends for which it was given, and aiding and protecting her in the pursuit of those ends.

The fusion of these two bodies into one, under the supreme headship of the Bishop of Rome, was not brought about without a long and violent struggle. In fact, as stated in the commencement of this note, statutes excluding the Pope and his agents from the kingdom had been enacted long before the Reformation. Of this a practical proof was given in the case of Lalor, a papal emissary in the times of James I, whose indictment was framed in accordance with ancient statutes, for the very purpose of showing that the denial of the Pope's supremacy was so far from being a novelty that it was in fact the old law of the realm. This case is also remarkable as having given occasion to the famous *fifth report* of Sir Edward Coke, in which he reviews the struggle for the supremacy; an extract from which is given at the end of this note.

I am aware that the statute (26 Henry VIII. cap. 1.) entitling the king the head of the English Church (and quoted in the passage to which this note refers) enacts that the king shall have power to reform "all such errors, heresies, abuses, &c., whatsoever, which by *any manner of spiritual authority* may be lawfully reformed," &c. ; and I am aware also that both Papists and Puritans (who are tied together, like Samson's foxes, with firebrands at their tails, and their heads diverse ways for the destruction of the Church of England) have thence inferred that the crown claims to be the source from which the bishops derive their office and all their jurisdiction, even the power of the keys. The Puritans made it one of their charges against Archbishop Laud, that "he had said he received his jurisdiction from God and from Christ, contrary to an act of Parliament (the act under consideration), which says *bishops derive their jurisdiction from the king.*" But the defence of the brave old bishop on this, as on other points, was prompt and conclusive. "That statute," he tells his truculent judges, "speaks plainly of jurisdiction *in foro contentioso*, and places of judicature, and no other. And all their forensical jurisdiction, &c., all bishops in England derive from the crown. But my order, my calling, my jurisdiction *in foro conscientie*, that is, from God and by divine and apostolical right.\* The jurisdiction mentioned in the statute is plainly of a temporal nature, and is called *spiritual*, because it deals with ecclesiastical persons and causes, and to distinguish it from the *merely* temporal power which deals with persons and things as they have reference to a common and not to a sacred use. The causes referred to (and mentioned soon after in the same statute) are causes testamentary, causes matrimonial, and divorces, tithes, oblations, obventions, &c., which, with the dispensations and other impositions, had been a drain to the kingdom and a source of enormous revenue to the Bishop of Rome. The purpose of this and the like statutes is to exclude the power of the Bishop of Rome over ecclesiastics and causes of this kind, and to restore that power to the crown ; and they are enacted under the proviso which in one of them is expressed, that neither "this act, nor any thing or things therein contained, shall be hereafter interpreted and expounded that your grace, your nobles and subjects, intend by the same to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in anything concerning the very articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom, or any other things declared by Holy Scriptures, and the Word of God, necessary to yours and their salvation ; but only

\* Wharton's Troubles and Trials of Laud. Folio, London, A. D. 1695, p. 309.

to make an ordinance, by policies necessary and convenient, to repress vice, and for the good conservation of the realm in peace, amity and tranquillity, from ravin and spoil; enforcing much the old ancient customs of this realm in that behalf, not minding to seek for any relief, or succors, or remedies for any worldly things, but within this realm, at the hands of your highness, your heirs and successors, kings of this realm; which have sought to have an imperial power and authority in the same, and not obliged in any worldly causes to any superior."

To repel this "sinister persuasion of evil-minded persons," as it is termed in the disclaimer of Elizabeth, of an intention on the part of the crown to assume to itself that authority which is merely spiritual, I need only refer to the form of consecration contained in the Ordinal, which has been repeatedly confirmed by parliamentary statutes, first by the act of Edward VI., annexing the Ordinal to the Prayer Book, and afterwards by the three several acts of Uniformity. For the form of consecration, as Bishop Gibson and others have remarked, expressly refers the jurisdiction of the English Bishops to a two-fold original; viz.: the WORD of GOD and the Laws of the Land; and plainly recognizes a power of jurisdiction derived to Bishops by divine right, *i. e.*, by the WORD of GOD, before and independently of that which is conferred on them by the laws of the realm. The part referred to is the question of the Archbishop to the Bishop elect, and the answer thereto, before the imposition of hands:

"Will you maintain and set forward, as much as shall lie in you, quietness, love and peace among all men; and such as be unjust and disobedient and criminous within your diocese, correct and punish, according to such AUTHORITY as you have by God's WORD, and as to you shall be committed by the ordinance of this realm? *Answer.* I will do so by the help of God."

From all which it appears, I apprehend, that the spiritual jurisdiction, mentioned in the statute, refers only to that *exterior* and *coercive* jurisdiction, which belongs to the sovereign authority of every nation, as they say in Great Britain, to the crown, or as we say here, to the people; which, though for awhile usurped by the Bishop of Rome, was restored at the Reformation to the crown; and which is clearly distinguished, on the one hand, in its nature, end and origin, from that power of jurisdiction which is *merely* spiritual; and, on the other hand, in its name, and in the objects on which it is exercised, from that which is *merely* temporal.

P. S. I give an extract from the fifth report of Sir Edward Coke,

above referred to, for the sake of the facts which it states, and which are not invalidated by an occasional sentiment or expression betraying the Erastianism of the author :

For, albeit, the kings of England were absolute emperors within their dominions, and had under them as learned a prelacy and clergy, as valiant and prudent a nobility, as free and wealthy a commonalty, as any was then in Christendom ; yet if we look into the stories and records of these two imperial kingdoms, we shall find that if these laws of provision and praemunire had not been made, they had lost the name of imperial, and of kingdoms too, and had been long since made tributary provinces to the Bishop of Rome, or rather part of St. Peter's patrimony in demesne. Our kings had had their sceptres wrested out of their hands, their crowns spurned off from their heads, their necks trod upon ; they had been made laquies or footmen to the Bishop of Rome, as some of the emperors and French kings were ; our prelates had been made his chaplains and clerks, our nobility his vassals and servants, our commons his slaves and villains, if these acts of manumission had not freed them. In a word, before the making of these laws, the flourishing crown and commonwealth of England was in extreme danger to have been brought into most miserable servitude and slavery, under color of religion and devotion to the See of Rome. And this was not only seen and felt by the king, and much repined at and protested against by the nobility, but the commons, the general multitude of the subjects, did exclaim and cry out upon it. For the commons of England may be an example unto all other subjects in the world in this, that they have ever been tender and sensible of the wrongs and dishonors offered unto their kings, and have ever contended to uphold and maintain their honor and sovereignty. And their faith and loyalty have been generally such, (though every age hath brought forth some particular monsters of disloyalty,) as no pretence of zeal or religion could ever withdraw the greater part of the subjects to submit themselves to a foreign yoke, no, not when popery was in her height and exaltation ; whereof this act and divers others of the same kind are clear and manifest testimonies. For this act of 16 Rich. II. was made at the prayer of the commons ; which prayer they make not for themselves, neither show they their own self-love therein, (as in other bills which contain their grievances,) but their love and zeal to the king and his crown. When after the Norman Conquest they importuned their kings for the great charter, they sought their own liberties ; and in other bills preferred commonly by the commons against shrieves, escheators, purveyors, or the like, they seek their own profit and ease. But here their petition is to the king, to make a law for the defence and maintenance of his own honor. They complain, that by bulls and processes from Rome, the king is deprived of that jurisdiction which belongs of right to his imperial crown ; that the king doth lose the service and council of his prelates and learned men by translations made by the Bishop of Rome ; that the king's laws are defeated at his will, the treasure of the realm is exhausted and ex-

ported to enrich his court; and that by those means the crown of England which hath ever been free, and subject unto none, but immediately unto God, should be submitted unto the Bishop of Rome, to the utter destruction of the king and the whole realm; which God defend, say they; and thereupon, out of their exceeding zeal and fervency, they offer to live and die with the king in defence of the liberties of the crown. And lastly, they pray and require the king, by way of justice, to examine all the lords in Parliament, what they thought of these manifest wrongs and usurpations, and whether they would stand with the king in defence of his royal liberties, or no. Which the king did according to their petition; and the lords spiritual and temporal did all answer, that these usurpations of the Bishop of Rome were against the liberties of the crown, and that they were all bound by their allegiance to stand with the king, and to maintain his honor and prerogative. And thereupon it was enacted with a full consent of the three estates, that such as should purchase in the court of Rome, or elsewhere, any bulls or processes, or other things which might touch the king in his crown and dignity royal, and such as should bring them into the realm, and such as should receive them, publish them, or execute them, they, their notaries, proctors, maintainers and counsellors, should be all out of the king's protection, their lands and goods forfeited to the king, their bodies attached if they might be found, or else process of *praemunire facias* to be awarded against them. Upon these motives, and with this affection and zeal of the people, was the statute of 16 Rich. II. made, whereupon we have framed our indictment.

Now let us look higher, and see whether the former laws made by King Edward I. and King Edward III. against the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, were not grounded upon the like cause and reason. The statute of 38 Edw. III., cap. 1, expressing the mischiefs that did arise by breves of citation, which drew the bodies of the people, and by bulls of provision and reservation of ecclesiastical benefits, which drew the wealth of the realm to the court of Rome, doth declare, that by these means the ancient laws, customs and franchises of the realm were confounded, the crown of our sovereign lord, the king, diminished, and his person falsely defamed, the treasure and riches of the land carried away, the subjects of the realm molested and impoverished, the benefices of holy Church wasted and destroyed, divine service, hospitality, alms-deeds and other works of charity neglected.

Again, 27 Edw. III., cap. 1, upon the grievous and clamorous complaint (for that phrase is here used) of the great men and commons touching citations and provisions, it is enacted, that the offenders shall forfeit their lands, goods and chattels, and that their bodies be imprisoned and ransomed at the king's will.

But in the statute 25 Edw. III., wherein the first law against provisors made, 25 Edw. I., is recited, there is a larger declaration of these inconveniences than in the two last acts before mentioned. For there all the commons of the realm do grievously complain, that whereas the holy Church of England was first founded in estate of prelacy by the kings and nobility of that realm, and by them en-

dowed with great possessions and revenues in lands, rents and advowsons, to the end the people might be informed in religion, hospitality might be kept, and other works of charity might be exercised within the realm; and whereas the king and other founders of the said prelaties were the rightful patrons and advowees thereof, and upon avoidance of such ecclesiastical promotions had power to advance thereunto their kinsmen, friends and other learned men of the birth of that realm, which being so advanced became able and worthy persons to serve the king in council, and other places in the commonweal; the Bishop of Rome, usurping the seignory of such possessions and benefices, did give and grant the same to aliens, which did never dwell in England, and to cardinals, which might not dwell there, as if he were rightful patron of those benefices; whereas by the law of England he never had right to the patronage thereof; whereby in short time all the spiritual promotions in the realm would be engrossed into the hands of strangers, canonical elections of prelates would be abolished, works of charity would cease, the founders and true patrons of churches would be disinherited, the king's council would be weakened, the whole kingdom impoverished, and the laws and rights of the realm destroyed. Upon this complaint it was resolved in parliament, that these oppressions and grievances should not be suffered in any manner; and therefore it was enacted, that the king and his subjects should thenceforth enjoy the rights of patronage; that free elections of archbishops, bishops, and other prelates elective, should be made according to the ancient grants of the king's progenitors and their founders; that no bulls or provision should be put in execution, but that the provisors should be attached, fined, and ransomed at the king's will, and withal imprisoned, till they had renounced the benefits of their bulls, satisfied the party grieved, and given sureties not to commit the like offence again.

Now, Mr. Lalor, what think you of these things? Did you believe that such laws as these had been made against the Pope 200, 250, 300 years since? Was King Henry VIII. the first prince that opposed the Pope's usurped authority? Were our Protestants the first subjects that ever complained of the court of Rome? Of what religion, think you, were the propounders and enacters of these laws? Were they good Catholics or good subjects, or what were they? You will not say they were Protestants, for you will not admit the reformed religion to be so ancient as those times; neither can you say they were undutiful, for they strove to uphold their liege lord's sovereignty. Doubtless the people in those days did generally embrace the vulgar errors and superstitions of the Romish Church, and in that respect were papists as well as you. But they had not learned the new doctrine of the Pope's supremacy, and transcendent authority over kings; they did not believe he had power to depose princes, and to discharge subjects of their allegiance, to abrogate the fundamental laws of kingdoms, and to impose his canons as binding laws upon all nations, without their consents; they thought it a good point of religion to be good subjects, to honor

their king, to love their country, and to maintain the laws and liberties thereof, howsoever in other points they did err and were misled with the Church of Rome.—*Hargrave's State Trials*, vol. xi.

---

E.—Page 6.

In the act of Parliament in the fifth year of Edward VI., which established these alterations by law, it is declared that the first book, or that of 1549, “*was agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church* ;” but “because there hath arisen in the use and exercise of the said common service divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the administration thereof, *rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakes*, than of any other worthy cause, therefore,” &c. In other words, the alterations were not made in consequence of any change in the opinion of the Church, nor in compliance with the rule by which its reformation had proceeded ; but they were made as a concession, in things not absolutely essential, to a faction which refined only to consume, and which, from that time to the present, has involved the Church of England in internal strife and dissension.

The chief of these alterations in the liturgy and communion service were :

1. In respect to the forms of the oblation and invocation in the consecration of the elements. In the liturgy of 1549 these forms were expressed, but were omitted in the revision of 1552.

2. In the delivery of the elements to communicants. In the liturgy of 1549, the priest, in giving the body, is directed to say, “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life ;” and to use a like form in delivering the cup. In the revision of 1552, the minister, in delivering the bread, was directed to say, “Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving ;” and to use a like form in giving the cup. In 1559 these two forms were united, as they now stand in the English and American Prayer Books.

3. In respect to *express* prayer for the faithful departed. In the general prayer of intercession the minister was directed to say :—“Let us pray for the whole state of Christ’s Church ;” and the prayer contained the following sublime and salutary words : “And here we do give unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all thy saints, from the beginning

of the world; and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose examples, (O Lord,) and steadfastness in Thy faith, and keeping Thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto Thy mercy, (O Lord,) all other Thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of Faith, and do now rest in the sleep of peace; grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world: Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate."

In the revision of 1552 the prayer was introduced with the words, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church *militant here on earth*;" and the act of commemoration, that is to say, the whole passage above quoted from the liturgy of 1549, was expunged. In 1662, however, the following act of commemoration, the same now used in the English and American Prayer Books, was adopted: "And we also bless thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom: Grant this," &c.

Our American Prayer Book contains express forms of the Oblation and Invocation, taken from the Liturgy of the Scotch Episcopal Church. It is also the honor of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and should be an inexpressible comfort to her members, that her liturgy commemorates the departed members of Christ's Church with an express prayer that they, as well as those members who are now militant on earth, may attain to a joyful resurrection and acquittal in the day of judgment. The prayer is introduced, as in the office of Edward VI., with the words, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church;" and the part to which I refer reads as follows: "And we also bless thy holy Name, for all thy servants, who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labors. And we yield unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all Thy saints, who have been the choice vessels of Thy grace, and the lights of the world in their several generations: most humbly beseeching Thee to give us grace to follow the example of their steadfastness in Thy faith, and obedience

to thy holy commandments, that at the general resurrection we, and all they who are of the mystical body of Thy Son, may be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: Grant this," &c.

In this connection I beg to lay before the reader the following letter of the illustrious Bishop HORSLEY, in which he expresses very decidedly his opinion of the comparative merits of the two English Liturgies of 1549 and 1552. It is in reply to a letter of the Rev. John Skinner, requesting of Bishop Horsley permission to publish a collation which he (Bishop Horsley) had made of the English and Scotch offices. The letter is given by Bishop Skinner, p. 157 of his judicious and learned treatise on "The Office for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," &c.

"MY DEAR SIR :

"Nothing but the unusual pressure of Parliamentary business has prevented me from returning an earlier answer to your favour of the 28th of last month. You are at full liberty to make the use proposed of my "Collation of Offices." With respect to the comparative merit of the two Offices for England and Scotland, I have no scruple in declaring to you, what some years since, I declared to Bishop Abernethy Drummond, that I think the Scotch Office more conformable to the primitive models, and in my private judgment more edifying, than that which we now use; insomuch that were I at liberty to follow my own private judgment, I would myself use the Scotch Office in preference. The alterations which were made in the communion-service, as it stood in the first book of Edward VI., to humour the Calvinists, were, in my opinion, much for the worse; nevertheless, I think our present Office is very good, our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient; I mean that the elements are consecrated by it, and made the body and blood of Christ, in the sense in which our Lord himself said the bread and wine were his body and blood. I remain,

My dear Sir,

Your affectionate and faithful Servant,

S. ST. ASAPHENS.

LONDON, *June 17th*, 1806."

"Anglia mœsta dole tantum tibi lumen ademptum :  
Patronum ablatum Scotia mœsta dole."

In quoting this letter of Bishop Horsley, and in humbly confessing not only that my judgment wholly approves, but that my heart also

warms with the distinctive excellencies of the Liturgy of 1549, I beg to say, that I neither entertain myself, nor have I a particle of sympathy with those (if any such there be) who do entertain, the least feeling of discontent or dissatisfaction with our present formularies. Indeed, when I consider how perilous the work, and at how perilous a crisis effected, of removing the many fables and superstitions that had grown over our ritual, my feelings of gratitude that all which gave just offence has been expunged, and that so much (beyond what is necessary) of comforting doctrine and pious usage has been saved and continued to us, are so strong, as completely to overpower and extinguish the regret which I might otherwise feel at the loss of the comparatively little that was sacrificed to the captiousness and spiritual vandalism of a party which was more bent on extirpating popery than on preserving the Catholic faith.

---

G.—Page 11.

In their treatment of heretics, the primitive bishops were content to follow the directions of St. Paul to Titus: "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted and *sinneth*;" (the last word suggests, that heresy, from the first, was understood to involve not only error of doctrine, but viciousness of life;) and Christian people were expected to do no more than to avoid those whom their bishops rejected. But after the establishment of Christianity under Constantine, the Emperors, believing the morals of the state to depend on the purity of the Church, conferred privileges on those who remained in her communion, from which others, whom the Church disowned as heretical, were excluded. Hence, after the council of Nice, A. D. 325, had declared the doctrine of the Arians to be heresy, it was decreed, by an Imperial edict, that they who, according to the faith and discipline of the Apostles, believed in the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, confessing the unity of the Divine Nature under a Trinity of persons, should receive the designation, and be admitted to the privilege of Catholic Christians; while all others should be treated as heretics. For some time after, heresies were connected with seditions and tumults; and hence the rigor of the laws against them, which, however, seldom proceeded to the penalty of death. At least Cardinal Bellar-

mine, who has ransacked all antiquity, sacred and profane, for his precedents, alleges no more of Theodosius, Valentinian, Martianus, and other religious Emperors, than that they "*sometimes*" resorted to the "*ultimum supplicium*;" taking for granted that the "*ultimum supplicium*" in these cases means death, and forgetting to mention that the Emperors had an eye rather to disorder and sedition in the State, than to erroneous opinion in the Church. The omission, however, (for I would not be too hard on Bellarmine, whose smooth and transparent latinity makes some amends for the harshness of his creed,) is pardonable in one who is firmly persuaded that an obstinate heretic ought to be killed, out of pure favor to himself; since the longer he lives the more errors does he devise, the more people does he pervert, and the greater the damnation he heaps upon his soul. "Denique (it is his crowning argument in favor of putting heretics to death,) hereticis obstinatis beneficium est, quo de hac vita tollantur; nam quo diutius vivant, eo plures errores excogitant, plures pervertunt, et majorem sibi damnationem acquirunt." (*Bellarmin. De Laicis*, cap. 21, last paragraph.)

Before the division of the Empire, (about the beginning of the 9th century,) the bishops appear to have confined themselves to the office of declaring what constituted heresy, leaving it to the temporal magistrate to prosecute the heretic. But after this period, as the canon law superseded the imperial code, and bishops stretched their powers from the persuasion of the souls of men, to the coercion of their bodies,\* things began to wear another face; and as *Pasce oves* was

\* The Council of Trent empowers bishops to imprison and inflict corporal punishments; and the spiritual power may always, according to Bellarmine, use the secular as its instrument, even as the soul uses the body, for the accomplishment of its purposes. But the temper of the Roman Church will be best understood by the two following canons, the first of the Third Council of Lateran, A. D. 1179, on the treatment of heretics, and the other of the Fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, on papal authority over the possessions of sovereign princes. By the creed of Pius IV. (see Appendix R.) all Romanists are obliged to confess these two canons as part of the Christian Faith, necessary to salvation. I have used Mr. Perceval's translation.

*Canon XXVII. (On the Treatment of Heretics.)*

Although ecclesiastical discipline, as the blessed Leo saith, being content with the judgment of the priests, does not take sanguinary revenge, yet is it assisted by the decrees of Catholic princes, that men may often seek a saving remedy through fear of corporal punishment. On this account, because in Gascony, Alb, and the parts of Thoulouse, and other places, the damnable perverseness of the heretics whom some call Cathari, others Patarenes, others Publicans, others by different names, has gained such strength, that they no longer practice their wickedness in secret, as at other times, but make open manifestation of their error, and draw over the weak and simple folk to an agreement with

made to conclude for the supremacy; so JOHN xv., 6, where withered branches are said to be cast into the fire and to be burnt, was made an unanswerable argument for dooming heretics to the flames. It was not, however, until the early part of the 13th century, that an instance of this dreadful punishment occurred in England. The Publicans, as they were called, who were burnt in many parts of France in the 12th century, (as others had before been in Italy,) though numerous in England, were not there suffered to receive this

them; we decree to subject them and their defenders and receivers to anathema; and under pain of anathema we forbid that any presume to maintain or support them in his houses or land, or to have any dealings with them. But if they depart in this sin, let not the oblation be made for them (under any pretext of privileges granted to any from us, on any other ground,) nor let them receive burial among Christians. In like manner we decree concerning the Brabançons, and the people of Aragon, Navarre, the Basque Provinces, and other ruffians who exercise such cruelty against the Christians, that they pay no respect to churches nor monasteries, nor spare widows and girls, old men and boys, nor any age or sex, but after the manner of heathens waste and destroy every thing; that they who have conducted them, or kept and supported them in the districts where they have so furiously conducted themselves, be publicly denounced throughout the churches on Sundays and other holy days, and be considered bound by the same sentence and penalty as the forementioned heretics, nor be admitted to the communion of the church, until they have abjured that pestilent company and heresy. And let all persons whatsoever who are bound to them by any agreement, know that they are released from all debt of fidelity or courtesy, or any manner of service, so long as they persist in such iniquity. Moreover, we enjoin them, and all others of the faithful, that for the remission of their sins, they manfully oppose such disasters, and with force of arms defend the Christian people against them, and let their goods be confiscated, and let it be free for princes to subject such persons to slavery. And whosoever shall there depart this life in true repentance, let them not doubt that they will obtain pardon of their sins, and the fruit of eternal reward. We also, out of the divine mercy, and relying on the authority of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, grant to the faithful Christians who have taken arms against them, and at the advice of the bishops or other prelates, have contended to drive them out, a relaxation for two years from enjoined penance: or if they have made a longer stay there, we leave it to the discretion of the bishops, to whom the care of these things is enjoined, that at their will, a greater indulgence in proportion to their labor, be granted unto them: but we order that those who shall contemptuously have refused to obey the warning of the bishops in this respect, be estranged from the participation in the body and blood of the Lord, &c.

*Canon III.—(Papal Authority over the Possessions of Sovereign Princes.)*

We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy which exalteth itself against this holy orthodox and Catholic faith, which we have set forth above: condemning all heretics, by whatsoever names they may be reckoned, who have indeed diverse faces, but their tails are bound together, for they make agreement in the same folly.

Let such persons, when condemned, be left to the secular powers who may be present, or to their officers, to be punished in a fitting manner, those who are of the clergy being first degraded from their orders: so that the goods of such condemned persons, being laymen, shall be confiscated; but in the case of clerks, be applied to the churches from which they received their stipends.

But let those who are only marked with suspicion, be smitten with the sword of anathemas, and shunned by all men, until they make proper satisfaction, un-

punishment. ("Publicani," says Roger Hoveden, A. D. 1182, as quoted by Twisden, "comburebantur in pluribus locis per regnum Franciæ, quod Rex Angliæ nullo modo permisit in terra sua, licet ibi essent perplurimi.") In the 13th century, however, there was one, and I believe but one instance, and in the 14th century but two instances, of this execrable punishment for heresy in England. About the commencement of the 15th century (A. D. 1400) occurs the case of William Sautre. Before this time there was no statute on the

less, according to the grounds of suspicion and the quality of the person, they shall have demonstrated their innocence by a proportionate purgation. So that if any shall persevere in excommunication for a twelvemonth, thenceforth they shall be condemned as heretics. And let the secular powers, whatever offices they may hold, be induced and admonished, and, if need be, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, that, as they desire to be accounted faithful, they should, for the defence of the faith, publicly set forth an oath, that to the utmost of their power they will strive to exterminate from the lands under their jurisdiction all heretics who shall be denounced by the church; so that whensoever any person is advanced, either to spiritual or temporal power, he be bound to confirm this decree with an oath.

But if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the church, shall neglect to cleanse his country of this heretical filth, let him be bound with the chain of excommunication, by the metropolitan, and the other co-provincial bishops. And if he shall scorn to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the supreme Pontiff: that, thenceforth, he may declare his vassals to be absolved from their fidelity to him, and may expose his land to be occupied by the Catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, may, without contradiction, possess it, and preserve it in purity of faith: saving the right of the chief lord, so long as he himself presents no difficulty and offers no hindrance in this matter: the same law, nevertheless, being observed concerning those who have not lords in chief.

But let the Catholics, who, having taken the sign of the cross, have girded themselves for the extermination of the heretics, enjoy the same indulgence, and be armed with the same privilege as is conceded to those who go to the assistance of the Holy Land.

But we who believe decree also to subject to excommunication, the receivers, the defenders, the abettors of the heretics; firmly determining that if any one, after he has been marked with excommunication, shall refuse to make satisfaction within a twelvemonth, he be thenceforth of right in very deed infamous, and be not admitted to public offices or councils, nor to elect for any thing of the sort, nor to give evidence. Let him also be intestible, so as neither to have power to bequeath nor to succeed to any inheritance.

Moreover, let no man be obliged to answer him in any matter, but let him be compelled to answer others. If, haply, he be a judge, let his sentence have no force, nor let any causes be brought for his hearing. If he be an advocate, let not his pleading be admitted. If a notary, let the instruments drawn up by him be invalid, and be condemned with their damned author. And we charge that the same be observed in similar cases. But if he be a clerk, let him be deposed from every office and benefice, that where there is the greatest fault, the greatest vengeance may be exercised.

But if any shall fail to shun such persons, after they have been pointed out by the church, let them be compelled, by the sentence of excommunication, to make fitting satisfaction. Let the clergy by no means administer the sacraments of the church to such pestilent persons, nor presume to commit them to Christian burial, nor receive their alms nor oblations: otherwise let them be deprived of their office, to which they must not be restored without the special indulgence of the Apostolic See.

subject, and the four persons above mentioned were punished under the common law, having been first convicted and condemned by ecclesiastical process; Sautre in a provincial council under the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The first parliamentary statute in relation to heresy (5 Richard II, cap. 5) was enacted A. D. 1381, and entitled "An act against preachers of heresie." The preamble sets forth that, "forasmuch as it is openly known that there be persons within the realm, going from county to county, and from town to town, in certain habits, under dissimulation of great holiness, and without license, etc., preaching daily, not only in churches and church-yards, but also in markets, fairs, and other open places where a great congregation is, divers sermons, containing heresies and notorious errors, to the great emblemishing of the Christian faith, etc.; which persons do also preach diverse matters of schlauder, to engender discord and dissension betwixt diverse estates of the said realm, as well spiritual as temporal, in exciting of the people to the great peril of all the realm; which preachers, cited or summoned before the ordinaries of the places, there to answer, etc., will not obey to their summons and commandments, nor care not for their monitions nor censures of the Holy Church, but expressly despise them, and moreover, by their subtil and ingenious words, do draw the people to hear their sermons, and do maintain them in their errors by strong hands and by great routs;" and the ordinance is, "that the king's commissions be made and directed to the sheriffs and other ministers of our sovereign lord the king, or other, etc., to arrest all such preachers, and also their fautors, maintainers and abettors, and to hold them in arrest and strong prisons till they will justify them according to the law and reason of the Holy Church." The statute imposes no other penalty, and is evidently intended merely to preserve the public peace, and not to punish men for their opinions. It does not encroach, I apprehend, on liberty of conscience.

The next statute (2 Henry IV., cap. 15) is entitled "An act touching heresies," and was enacted A. D. 1400, the same year in which Sautre was burnt. This act is remarkable in itself, and so important in estimating the true nature of the reformation, and the bearings respectively of the Papal and Regal supremacy, that I transcribe the ordinance entire, omitting the long and tedious preamble. It is entitled "AN ACT TOUCHING HERESIES," and enacts:

That none within the said realm, or any other dominions subject to his Royal Majesty, presume to preach openly or privily, without license

of the diocesan of the same place first required and obtained; Curates in their own churches, and persons hitherto privileged, and other of the canon law granted, only except. For that none, from henceforth, any thing preach, hold, teach, or instruct, openly or privily, or make or write any book contrary to the Catholic faith, or determination of the Holy Church, nor of such sect and wicked doctrines and opinions shall make any conventicles, or in any wise hold or exercise schools; and, also that none from henceforth, in any wise, favor such preacher, or maker of any such and like conventicles, or holding or exercising schools, or making or writing such books, or so teaching, informing, or exciting the people; nor any of them maintain, or anywise sustain. And that all and singular having such books, or any writings of such wicked doctrine and opinions, shall really with effect deliver or cause to be delivered, all such books and writings to the diocesan of the same place within forty days from the time of the proclamation of this ordinance and statute. And if any person or persons, of whatsoever kind, estate, or condition that he or they be, from henceforth do or attempt against the royal ordinance and statute aforesaid, in the premises or in any of them, or such books in the form aforesaid do not deliver, then the diocesan of the same place in his diocese, such person or persons in this behalf defamed or evidently suspected, and every of them, may, by the authority of the said ordinance and statute, cause to be arrested, and under safe custody in his prisons to be detained, till he or they of the articles laid to him or them in this behalf, do canonically purge him or themselves, or else such wicked sect, preachings, doctrines, and heretical and erroneous opinions, do abjure according as the laws of the church do require, so that the said diocesan by himself or his commissaries do openly and judicially proceed against such persons so arrested, and remaining under his said custody, to all the effect of the law, and determine that same business according to the canonical decrees within three months after the said arrest, any lawful impediment ceasing. And if any person, in any case above expressed, be before the diocesan of the place or his commissaries canonically convict; then the same diocesan may do to be kept in his prison, the said person so convict for the manner of his default, and after the quality of the offence according and as long as to his discretion shall seem expedient, and moreover, to put the same person to the secular court, (except in cases where he according to the canonical decree ought to be left.) to pay to our sovereign lord the king his pecuniar fine, according as the same fine shall seem competent to the diocesan, for the manner and quality of the offence, in which case the same diocesan, shall be bound to certify the king of the same fine in his exchequer by his letters patents, sealed with his seal, to the effect that such fine by the king's authority, may be required and levied to his use of the goods of the same person so convict. And if any person within the said realm and dominions, upon the said wicked preachings, doctrines, opinions, schools, and heretical and erroneous informations, or any of them be before the diocesan of the same place or his commissaries sententially convict, and the same wicked sect, preachings, doctrines and opinions, schools and infor-

mations, do refuse duly to abjure, or by the diocesan of the same place or his commissaries after the abjuration made by the same person pronounced, fall into relaps, so that according to the holy canons he ought to be left to the secular court, whereupon credence shall be given to the diocesan of the same place, or to his commissaries in this behalf, then the shiriff of the county of the same place, and mayor, and shiriffs or shiriff, or mayor and bailiffs of the city, town and borough of the same county, next to the same diocesan or the same commissaries, shall be personally present in preferring of such sentences, when they by the same diocesan or his commissaries shall be required; and they the same persons and every of them, after such sentence promulgate, shall receive; and them before the people in an high place do to be burnt, that such punishment may strike in fear to the minds of other, whereby no such wicked doctrine, and heretical and erronius opinions, nor their authors and fautors in the said realm and dominions against the Catholick faith, Christian law and determination of the holy Church, (which God prohibit.) be sustained or in any wise suffered, in which all and singular the premises concerning the said ordinance and statute, the shiriffs, mayors and bailiffs, of the said counties, cities, boroughs and towns, shall be attending, aiding and supporting, to the said diocesans and their commissaries."

This statute, it will be seen, ordains that no person in the king's dominions, or subject to his royal majesty, shall hold, teach or instruct openly or privately, or make or write any book contrary to the Catholic faith or determination of holy Church; that none shall favor, maintain, or in any wise sustain, those who make or write such books; that all and singular who have such books or writings shall deliver them to the bishop; and that the bishop may arrest and detain in safe custody in his (the bishop's) prison all who are accused of transgressing in any of these particulars, until they can purge themselves from suspicion. But this is not the worst; for all persons who had the misfortune to be suspected of heresy, are directed by the statute to be detained in custody, until they abjure their erroneous opinions, so that (here lies the craftiness of this tyrannical act) "the diocesan by himself, or his commissaries, do openly and judicially proceed against such persons so arrested and remaining under his said custody, to all the effect of the law, and determine that same business *according to the canonical decrees* within three months after the said arrest."

The statute enacts that the man who is convicted of heresy shall be burnt to death; but what does it tell us that heresy is? On this point it is utterly vague and undefined. And whom does it declare to be the judges of heresy, and by what rule does it authorize them to proceed in the determination of heresy? The bishops were to be

the judges of heresy. Very well. And the rule of judgment, what was that? The Scriptures? The known definitions of the Catholic Church? Nothing of the sort, but their own *canonical decrees*; that is, any thing and every thing which might be made to appear repugnant, not to the well known compendious and immutable faith of the Catholic Church, but to the expansive and expanding canons and decrees enacted and administered by bishops subject to the See of Rome. Any man, indeed, who failed in aught in obedience to his bishop, as (to take Lord Coke's instance) in the payment of a legacy, might, under this statute, be brought under suspicion of heresy, detained in the bishop's prison until he had yielded to his extortion, and possibly condemned to the stake as a heretic, when in fact he had done no more than (and perhaps not so much as) transgress a canon, of the bare existence of which he had never heard. We shall see presently that these evils were not imaginary.

The above act of Henry IV. is moreover remarkable as being the first on the English statute book that made heresy a capital offence, and ordained the heretic to be burnt. The next statute in relation to heresy is entitled "An Act for the Reformation of Heresy and Lollardy." The preamble declares, that "Forasmuch as great rumors, congregations and insurrections, here in the realm of England, by divers of the king's liege people, as well by them which were of the sect of heresy, commonly called Lollards, as for other of their confederacy, excitation and abetment, now of late were made, to the intent to annul, destroy and subvert the Christian faith and the law of God and holy Church within the same realm of England, and also to destroy the same, our sovereign lord the king, and all other manner of estates of the same realm of England, as well spiritual as temporal, and also all manner of policy, and finally the laws of the land;" and appears to be aimed against heretics not *as such*, but as disturbers of the peace and subverters of the laws of the kingdom. It enacts that all officers, on their admission to office, shall take an oath to destroy Lollardy and assist the Ordinary therein, and empowers justices of the peace to inquire of offences against the act, and have the offender, unless indicted for an offence which belongs to the cognizance of the secular judge, delivered to the Ordinary. It humanely provides that suspected persons, while in custody of the sheriff, may be admitted to mainprise, and moreover gives them the benefit of a trial by jury, before they are surrendered to the spiritual power to be tried for heresy. It leaves the former acts unrepealed.

The above are all the statutes touching heresy, which were enacted before the reformation, and they continued in force until A. D., 1533. The most important of them is the statute of Henry IV., and taken together, they will give the reader some insight into the nature of the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction in England; showing it to be an outward and coercive power, originally granted by the crown, to the Bishop of Rome, for the advancement of morals and religion, and abused by the grantee, by means of canons and decrees, administered by bishops responsible to himself, for the purpose of bringing the conscience, estate and liberties of the subject under his own control. What the crown gave under Henry IV., it took away (as it had a perfect right to do) under Henry VIII.; and, if I mistake not, it was the divorce of the latter from the Pope and canon law of Rome, which made him a monster of iniquity in the eyes of the papacy, far more than his divorce from Catherine of Aragon.

The statute of Henry IV. was repealed by 25 Henry VIII., cap. 14, and I crave from the reader a careful perusal of the preamble of the latter statute assigning the reasons for the repeal of the former. A comparison of the two will put him in no worse position than before for judging for himself, whether the rights and liberty of conscience for which the English people and their American descendants are proudly distinguished, have been owing to the papal jurisdiction in England, or to its overthrow and continued exclusion.

#### 25 HENRY VIII., CAP. 14.

##### *An Act for the Punishment of Heresie.*

In most humble wise lamentably sheweth unto your highness, your most humble, loving and obedient subjects, the commons of this your realm, that where the clergy of the same, in the second year of king Henry the IV., one of your most noble progenitors, upon their suggestion did interpret and obtain by authority of the Parliament, holden in the said second year, that it should be lawful for every Ordinary to convent, arrest and imprison any person or persons, whom they thought defamed or suspect of heresy, and them to keep in their prisons till they were purged thereof, or abjured, or committed to lay power to be burned, after the determination of the holy Church, and canonical sanctions, as in an act made at the Parliament, holden in the said second year of king Henry the IV., amongst other things more at large doth appear. Forasmuch as the said act doth not in any part thereof declare any certain cases of heresy, contrary to the determination of the holy Scripture, or the canonical sanctions therein expressed, whereby your most loving and obedient subjects might be learned to eschew the dangers and pains in the said act comprised, and to abhor and detest that foul and detestable crime of heresy; and, also, because those words canonical sanctions, and

such other like, contained in the said act, are so general, that unmeth\* the most expert and best learned man of this your realm, diligently lying in wait upon himself, can eschew and avoid the penalty and dangers of the same act and canonical sanctions, if he should be examined upon such captious interrogatories, as is, and hath been accustomed to be, ministered by the Ordinaries of this realm, in cases where they will suspect any person or persons of heresy. And over this, forasmuch as it standeth not with the right order of justice nor good equity, that any person should be convict, and put to the loss of his life, good name, or goods, unless it were by due accusation and witness, or by presentment, verdict, confession or process of outlawry; and, also, by the laws of your realm, for treason committed to the peril of your most royal majesty, upon whose surity dependeth the whole wealth of this realm, no person can, nor may be put to death but by presentment, verdict, confession, or process of outlawry, as is aforesaid. Wherefore it is not reasonable, that any Ordinary, by any suspicion conceived of his own fantasie, without due accusation or presentment, should put any subject of this realm in the infamy and slander of heresy, to the peril of life, loss of name and goods. And, that also, there be many heresies and pains, and punishment for heresies declared and ordained, in and by the canonical sanctions, and by the laws and ordinances made by the Popes or Bishops of Rome, and by their authorities, for holding, doing, preaching or speaking of things contrary to the said canonical sanctions, laws and ordinances, which be but humane, being meer repugnant and contrarious to the prerogative of your imperial crown, regal jurisdiction, laws, statutes, and ordinances of this your realm; by reason whereof your people of your said laws, statutes and prerogative royal, by authority of that act, made in the said second year of king Henry the IV., may be brought into slander of heresy, to their great infamy and danger, and peril of their lives. In consideration whereof it may please your highness, by the assent of your lords spiritual and temporal and commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, to annul, abrogate, frustrate, and make void the said act, made in the second year of king Henry the IV., and everything therein contained. (*Gibson's Codex*, p. 410.)

The remainder of this statute, however, goes on to provide for the punishment of heresy and lollardy under certain specific restrictions, and unhappily concludes by ordaining that the condemned person refusing to abjure his errors, "shall be committed to the lay power to be burnt in open places, for example of others, as hath been accustomed."

The next statute is that of 1 Edward VI., cap. 12, and it deserves to be emphatically noticed that by this statute *all* previous acts of Parliament touching religious opinions are, without reservation, repealed and annulled. The third section of the act is as follows:

\* An obsolete word, signifying *scarcely* or *hardly*.

iii.—And also be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all acts of Parliament and statutes, touching, mentioning, or in anywise concerning religion or opinions, that is to say, as well the statute made in the fifth year of the reign of the king's noble progenitor, king Richard the II., and the statute made in the second year of the reign of king Henry the V., and the statute also made in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of king Henry the VIII., concerning punishment and reformation of hereticks and lollards, and every provision therein contained, . . . shall from henceforth be repealed, and utterly void and of none effect." (*Ibid.* p. 404.)

On the death of Edward VI., and the accession of Mary, the papal party again came into power, and instantly the sanguinary statutes reappear.

#### 1 MAR. CAP. 6.

*An Act for the Reviving of the three Statutes made for the Punishment of Heresies.*

For the eschuing and avoiding of errors and heresies, which of late have risen and grown, and much increased within this realm, for that the Ordinaries have wanted authority to proceed against those that were infected therewith. Be it therefore ordained and enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that the statute made in the fifth year of the reign of king Richard the II., concerning the arresting and apprehension of erroneous and heretical preachers, and one other statute made in the second year of the reign of king Henry the IV., concerning repressing of heresies and punishment of hereticks, and, also, one other statute made in the second year of the reign of king Henry the V., concerning the suppression of heresy and lollardy, and every article, branch and sentence contained in the same three several acts, and every of them, shall from the twentieth day of January next coming, be revived and be in full force, strength and effect, to all intents, constructions and purposes for ever. (*Ibid.* p. 405.)

Thus the atrocious statute of Henry IV., which, for the gravest reasons, and after manifold experience of its evils, had been repealed in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., was revived under Mary, and bequeathed as a precious legacy to the English Church and nation "for ever!" The revival of it conferred once more an inquisitorial power on the "Ordinaries," *i. e.* the bishops, "who (which was a sad spectacle to behold) polluted England in all parts thereof by burning Protestants alive. For," continues the truthful Camden, who was living at the time, "they destroyed more of all ranks and qualities; bishops, ministers of God's Word, and of the common people, by this horrible kind of death, within the space of five years,

than (as some have observed) king Henry the VIII. did in full seven and thirty years; or than England ever saw so served since the time that in the reign of king John, Christians first began among us to tyrannize one over another with fire and faggot."

On the accession of Elizabeth, the coercive jurisdiction in England, which the Bishop of Rome had originally received as a trust from the crown, and had afterwards claimed as his own and sought to use, to the ruin of every sovereign that did not bow to him the neck, was forever restored to the crown. This was done by the act entitled "An act to restore to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state Ecclesiastical," passed in the first year of Elizabeth, the fifteenth section of which reads as follows:

§ XV. And, that also, it may please your highness, that it may be further established and enacted by the authority aforesaid; That one act and statute made in the first and second years of the late king Philip and queen Mary, entitled, an act for the reviving of three statutes, made for the punishment of heresies; and, also, the said three statutes mentioned in the said act, and by the same acts revived, and all and every branches, articles, clauses and sentences contained in the said several acts and statutes, and every of them, shall be from the last day of this session of Parliament, deemed and remain utterly repealed, void, and of none effect, to all intents and purposes; anything in the said several acts, or any of them contained, or any other matter or cause to the contrary notwithstanding. (*Gibson's Codex*, p. 405.)

Thus it appears that when the papal party came into power under Mary, the statutes punishing religious opinions with temporal penalties having been previously repealed under Edward VI., were revived and enforced, and when that party went out of power these statutes were again repealed. These are facts, from which every reader may draw his own conclusions. How long it would have been, had the same party remained in power, before erroneous opinions would have ceased to be punishable by confiscation of goods, and by fire and faggot, and whether, if papists should regain the power, they would again make the same use of it, are merely speculative questions on which I have no disposition to dwell. Perhaps the present state of things in Naples and Tuscany may throw light on the subject.

The reader may ask whether in this act of Elizabeth, repealing all former statutes, there were no reservation, continuing heresy as a punishable offence? Certainly there was, but it was one which so defined and limited the offence, that it could not well be abused to the purposes of tyranny. It is found in the 36th section of the act:

§ XXXVI. Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such person or persons to whom your highness, your heirs or successors, shall hereafter by letters patent, under the great seal of England, give authority to have or execute any jurisdiction, power, or authority spiritual, or to visit, reform, order, or correct any errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, or enormities by virtue of this act, shall not in anywise have authority or power to order, determine, or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four general councils, or any of them, or by any other general council, wherein the same was declared heresy, by the express and plain words of the said canonical scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy, by the high court of Parliament of this realm, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation; anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding. (*Ibid*, p. 425, Sec. XXXVI.)

"The ground of making this limitation," says Gibson, "was a retrospect to the times of popery, in which everything was adjudged to be heresy that the Church of Rome thought fit to call by that name, how far soever, in its own nature, from being *fundamental*, and how contrary soever to the gospel and the ancient doctrine of the Catholic Church; such as speaking against pilgrimages, against the worship of images, against the necessity of auricular confessions, and the like." No trap like that of the "canonical decrees," is set for the unwary; the rule for the determination of heresy is made to be the same as that adopted by the emperors of Christian Rome, a rule founded in reason and equity; viz., the original records of the Christian Church, as held and explained by the common and universal sense of the Christian Church; in other words, the decrees of the only really œcumenical councils; or the plain and express declarations of Holy Scripture; or, the concurrent voice of the clergy and laity of the nation.

Nothing, as it seems to me, is wanting to bring this statute into harmony with liberty of conscience, as distinguished from the restraints of tyranny on the one hand, and from the wayward humors of men on the other, except the prohibition of *temporal penalties* for errors of opinion. Unhappily this prohibition was wanting, and Christian England in consequence presented, both in this and the following reign, several examples of punishment for opinion, which cannot be justified. This most cruel and disgraceful stain on the English law, however, was wiped out by 29 Charles II., cap. 9, on which Bishop Gibson has a note, which sufficiently shows the state and position of the Church of England: "Upon the abrogating of all the

ancient statutes made against hereticks, the cognisance of heresie and punishment of hereticks returned into its ancient channel and bounds ; and now belongs to the Archbishop, as metropolitan of the province, and to every bishop within his own proper diocese, who are to punish only by ecclesiastical censures." (*Ibid.* p. 427.)

Thus in the treatment of heresy, the Church of Christ, after being tossed for centuries on an ocean of strife and blood, is restored in England, and through the labors of the Church of England, to the apostolic rule ; him that is an heretic, reject and avoid ; deal with him by spiritual censures, but lay not on him the hand of secular power : neither give the name of *heresy* (which consists in the denial of some *fundamental* point of the Christian faith) to every opinion supposed to be erroneous, lest your zeal against it involve you unconsciously in acts of oppression and tyranny ; nor yet resolve it into a difference of private opinion, lest, while you thus cause it to evaporate, you be found to deny the objective reality of the Christian faith ; but look upon it as a real evil ; make the plain words of Scripture and the judgment of the Universal Church the criterion for its detection, and express your displeasure of it only by spiritual censures. This, if I rightly read the above statutes, is the ground of the Church of England ; and, on this ground, *Esto perpetua !*

---

## II.—Page 11.

The following account of the bishops that were deprived under Elizabeth, and of the treatment which they received, is from Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation. I have compared it with Dr. Lingard, vol. vii., note H., on the reign of Elizabeth, and I have also compared Lingard's statement with the account of the deprived bishops in the "Execution for treason," &c., of Burleigh, the lord treasurer under Elizabeth, and with the more minute account of them by Bishop Andrewes (who may also be regarded as a contemporary witness,) *Tortura Torti*, pp. 146, 147, London, 1609 ; and have no fear that the correctness of Burnet's narrative on this point will be impeached.

"When the Parliament was over, the oath of supremacy was soon after put to the bishops and clergy. They thought, if they could stick close to one another in refusing it, the queen would be forced to dispense with them, and would not, at one stroke, turn out all the

bishops in England. It does not appear how soon after the dissolution of the Parliament the oath was put to them ; but it was not long after ; for the last collation Bonner gave of any benefice, was on the 6th May this year, (1559.) The oath being offered to Heath, Archbishop of York ; to Bonner of London ; Thirleby of Ely ; Bourn, of Bath and Wells ; Christopherson of Chichester ; Bain of Lichfield ; White of Winchester, and Watson of Lincoln ; Oglethorpe of Carlisle ; Tuberville of Exeter ; Pool of Peterburg ; Scot of Chester ; Pates of Worcester ; and Goldwell of St. Asaph ; they did all refuse to take it ; so that only Kitchen, Bishop of Landaff, took it. There was some hope of Tonstall ; so it was not put to him till September ; but he being very old, chose to go out with so much company, more for the decency of things, than out of any scruple he could have about the supremacy for which he had formerly writ so much. They were upon their refusal put in prison for a little while ; but they had all their liberty soon after, except Bonner, White and Watson. There were great complaints made against Bonner, that he had, in many things, in the prosecution of those that were presented for heresie, exceeded what the law allowed ; so that it was much desired to have him made an example ; but as the queen was of her own nature merciful, so the reformed divines had learned in the gospel, not to render evil for evil, nor to seek revenge ; and as Nazianzen had of old exhorted the orthodox, when they had got an emperor that favoured them, not to retaliate on Arians for their former cruelties ; so they thought it was for the honour of their religion to give this real demonstration of the conformity of their doctrine, to the rules of the gospel and of the Primitive Church, by avoiding all cruelty and severity, when it looked like revenge.

“All this might have been expected from such a queen, and such bishops ; but it shewed a great temper in the whole nation, that such a man as Bonner had been, was suffered to go about in safety, and was not made a sacrifice to the revenge of those who had lost their near friends by his means. Many things were brought against him and White, and some other bishops ; upon which the queen promised to give a charge to the visitors, whom she was to send over England, to enquire into these things ; and after she had heard their report, she said she would proceed as she saw cause ; by this means she did not deny justice, but gained a little time to take off edge that was on men's spirits, who had been much provoked by the ill usage they had met with from them.

“Heath was a man of a generous temper, and so was well used by the queen ; for as he was suffered to live securely at his own house in Surrey, so she went thither sometimes to visit him. Tonstall and Thirleby lived in Lambeth with Parker, with great freedom and ease ; the one was learned and good natured, the other was a man of business ; but too easie and flexible. White and Watson were morose, sullen men ; to which their studies, as well as their tempers, had disposed them, for they were much given to scholastical divinity, which inclined men to be cynical, to overvalue themselves, and despise others. Christopherson was a good Grecian, and had translated Eu-

sebius and the other Church historians into Latin, but with as little fidelity as may be expected from a man violently addicted to a party; Bain was learned in the Hebrew, which he had professed at Paris, in the reign of Francis the I. All these chose to live still in England; only Pates, Scot and Goldwell, went beyond sea; after them went the lord Morley, Sir Francis Englefield, Sir Robert Peckham, Sir Thomas Shelly and Sir John Gage, who, it seems, desired to live where they might have the free exercise of their religion; and such was the queen's gentleness, that this was not denied them, tho' such favour had not been shewed in Queen Marie's reign. Fecknam, Abbot of Westminster, was a charitable and generous man, and lived in great esteem in England. Most of the monks returned to a secular course of life, but the nuns went beyond sea." (*Burnet's Reform*, vol. ii., pp. 396, 397, fol. London, 1683.)

---

I.—Page 12.

On Elizabeth's accession to the throne, A. D. 1558, among other announcements to foreign powers, she "sent to Sir Edward Karn, who had been Queen Mary's resident at Rome, to give the Pope news of the succession. The haughty Pope (Paul IV) received it in his ordinary style, declaring, 'That England was held in fee of the Apostolick See; that she could not succeed being illegitimate, nor could he contradict the declarations made in that matter by his predecessors, Clement the VII. and Paul the III. He said, it was great boldness in her to assume the crown without his consent; for which in reason she deserved no favour at his hands; yet, if she would renounce her pretensions, and refer herself wholly to him, he would shew a fatherly affection to her, and do everything for her that could consist with the dignity of the Apostolick See.' When she heard of this, she was not much concerned at it; for she had written to Karn as she did to her other ministers, and had renewed his powers upon her first coming to the crown, being unwilling in the beginning of her reign to provoke any party against her; but hearing how the Pope received this address, she recalled Karn's powers, and commanded him to come home. The Pope on the other hand required him not to go out of Rome, but to stay and take care of an hospital over which he set him; which it was thought that Karn procured to himself, because he was unwilling to return into England, apprehending the change of religion that might follow, for he was himself zealously

addicted to the see of Rome." (*Burnet's History of the Reformation*, vol. ii. p. 374, folio edition.)

The first complaint of these proceedings came not from England, but from Rome itself. For the succeeding Pope, Pius IV., coming the next year to the papacy, condemned the mad and insolent answer which his predecessor had made to the address of the Queen of England; and to prove his sincerity, "sent one Parpalia to her, in the second year of her reign, to invite her to joyn herself to that see, and he would disannul the sentence against her mother's marriage, confirm the English service, and the use of the Sacrament in both kinds; but she sent the agent word to stay at Brussels, and not to come over. The same treatment met Abbot Martinengo, who was sent the year after with the like message. From that time, all treaty with Rome was entirely broken off." (*Ibid*, p. 417.)

"However, the next year the Pope renews his applications, and sends another Nuncio, viz: Abbot Martinengo alias Martinego, who (it is said) staid in Flanders till he sent to ask leave to be admitted into the kingdom; but the queen saw it not safe to admit him, thinking it implied a tacit acknowledgment of the Pope's usurped supremacy, whereof he was now justly deprived by act of Parliament, and withal, she considered what advantages the Popes have always made to themselves from the smallest concession; and that which (doubtless) increased the queen's dislike to the Nuncio's entrance was, that the very noise of his coming had so wrought upon some papists, that they not only openly violated the laws made against the Pope and his authority in former reigns, but spread false reports, that the queen was at a point to change her religion, and alter the government of the realm; whilst others practised with the devil by conjurations, charms, and casting figures, to be informed of the length of her reign; and at the same time the Pope's legate being in Ireland, not only joined himself to some desperate traytors, who were employed in stirring up rebellion there, but as much as in him was, deprived her majesty of all right and title to that kingdom. Add to all this, that there was a law as ancient as Henry the II.'s time, which commands that if any one be found bringing in the Pope's letters or mandate, let him be apprehended, and let justice pass upon him without delay, as a traytor to the king and kingdom. Upon these and other considerations the Nuncio was denied entrance." (*Gibson's Tracts*, vol. iii., tit. xiii., *with references*.)

That Pius IV. dispatched Vincentio Parpalia, Abbot of St. Saviour, to the Queen of England, with a flattering letter, and with secret instructions of some sort or other, is certain, and that these secret instructions pledged the see of Rome to approve the English Liturgy on condition of the queen's acknowledging the Pope's jurisdiction in Eu-

gland, is also rendered pretty certain from the researches and statement of Burnet, especially when taken in connection with the Pope's letter, which the reader may be pleased to peruse :

*To our most dear Daughter in Christ, Elizabeth, Queen of England.*

Our most dear Daughter in Christ, greeting, and Apostolicall Benediction : How greatly we do desire (according as our Pastorall office requireth) to take care of your Salvation, and to provide as well for your Honour as the establishment of your Kingdome, both God the searcher of our hearts knoweth, and you yourself may understand by the instructions which we have given to this our beloved son, Vincentio Parpalia, Abbot of Saint Saviour, a man known unto you, and of us well approved, to be by him imparted unto you. We do therefore (most dear daughter) exhort and admonish your highness again and again, that, rejecting bad counsellors which love not you but themselves, and serve their own desires, you would take the fear of God to counsell, and acknowledge the time of your visitation, obeying our fatherly admonitions and wholesome advices ; and promise to yourself all things concerning us which you shall desire of us, not onely for the salvation of your soul, but also for the establishing and confirming of your royall dignity, according to the authority, place and function committed unto us by God, who if you return into the bosome of the Church, (as we wish and hope you will) are ready to receive you with the same love, honour and rejoicing, wherewith that father in the gospel received his son that returned unto him. Although our joy shall be so much the greater than his, in that he rejoyced for the salvation of one son only ; but you, drawing with you all the people of England, shall not only by your own salvation, but also by the salvation of the whole nation, replenish us and all our brethren in generall (whom God willing, you shall hear shortly to be congregated in an Œcumenicall Council for abolishing of heresies,) and the whole Church with joy and gladness ; yea, you shall also glad heaven itself, and purchase by so memorable a fact admirable glory to your name, and a much more renowned crown than that which you wear. But of this matter the same Vincentio shall treat with you more at large, and shall declare unto you our fatherly affection, whom we pray your highness that you will graciously receive, diligently hear, and give the same credit to his speech which you would doe to ourself. Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, etc., the 15th day of May, 1560, in our first year. (*Camden*, p. 46.)

Here the Pope assures the queen that she may promise to herself concerning him, all things that she could desire of him, not only for the salvation of her soul, but also "*for the establishment and confirming of her royal dignity*," according to the authority, &c., committed to him by God. Certainly the queen's honour and dignity were most deeply concerned in maintaining the order which had been so deliber-

ately established, and therefore the Pope can hardly be understood to mean less than that he would sanction the changes which had been made in the Church of England, provided she would acknowledge his supremacy. There is nothing, I apprehend, in the changes themselves, to make such a proposition incredible, (for rather than lose the brightest gem in his crown, and the usurped right of confirming the English bishops in their jurisdiction, the Pope would have been content not only to concede the marriage of priests, and communion in both kinds, for which he could find precedents, but even to receive and allow, as some of his followers have since done, the XXXIX Articles themselves,) and much in the antecedents of the papacy to render it probable; it having ever been the systematic policy of the Roman see, and one great means of attaining to the power which it then wielded, when it could neither sell nor retain anything in dispute, to give it, that the gift may serve as a precedent in after time for the right of the said see to dispose of the same at its pleasure.

If the reader desire any further proof than the strong presumption, afforded by the letter of the Pope, and confirmed by the statement of Burnet, he may have it from Sir Edward Coke, who has averred the fact, and declared that he himself received his information directly from the queen. I take this account from Sir Roger Twisden, (*Historical Vindication*, p. 176, A.D. 1675,) who refers to a charge of Sir Edward Coke, at Norwich, then in print. Having remarked that some had objected to this statement, that it was not divulged until A. D. 1606, or 46 years after the information was alleged to have been received from the queen, and while she was not living to contradict it, Sir Roger adds: "For the being first mentioned 46 years after, that is not so long a time, but many might remember: and I myself have received it from such as I cannot doubt of it, they having had it from persons of high relation unto them who were actors in the managing of the business. Besides, the thing itself was in effect printed many years before; for he that made the answer to Saunders in his seventh book, *De Visibili Monarchia*, who it seems had been very careful to gather the beginnings of Queen Elizabeth, that there might be an exact history of her, tandem aliquando, quia omnia acta diligenter observavit, qui summis reipublicæ negotiis consulto interfuit (by one who had been a careful observer of events, and had taken part in public affairs,) relates it thus:

"That a nobleman of this country being about the beginning of the queen's reign at Rome, Pius IV. asked him of her majesty's east-

ing his authority out of England, who made answer that she did it, being perswaded by testimonies of Scripture, and the laws of the realm, nullam illius esse in terra aliena jurisdictionem, [that the Pope had no jurisdiction in a country foreign to his own dominions;] which the Pope seemed not to believe, her majesty being wise and learned, but did rather think the sentence of that court against her mother's marriage to be the true cause, which he did promise not only to retract, sed in ejus gratiam quæcunque possum præterea facturum, dum illa ad nostram ecclesiam se recipiat, & debitum mihi primatus titulum reddat, [but will do moreover whatever I can in her favour, provided she will return to our Church and restore to me the due title of the primacy,] and then adds, Extant apud nos articuli Abbatis Sanctæ Salutis manu conscripti, extant Cardinalis Moronæ literæ, quibus nobilem illum vehementer hortabatur, ut eam rem nervis omnibus apud reginam nostram sollicitaret. Extant hodie nobilium nostrorum aliquot, quibus papa multa aureorum millia pollicitus est, ut istius amicitie atque fœderis inter Romanam Cathedram & Elizabetham serenissimam authores essent; [that is, as I understand, the author quoted by Twisden adds; there are extant among us the articles of instruction to the Abbot of St. Saviour, written in the Pope's own hand; and the letter of Cardinal Morona, in which he exhorts that functionary to use all his influence to press this matter with our queen; and there are now living several of our nobles to whom the Pope made large promises of money, provided they would effect the desired reconciliation and friendship between the Roman see and our most gracious Queen Elizabeth.] This I have cited the more at large, for that Camden seems to think, what the Abbot of St. Saviour propounded was not in writing, and because it being printed seven years before the Cardinal Moronas' death, by whose privity (as protector of the English) this negotiation past, without any contradiction from Rome, there can no doubt be made of the truth of it. And assuredly, some who have conveniency and leisure may find more of it than hath been yet divulged; for I no way believe the Bishop of Winchester would have been induced to write, it did constare (it was true) of Paulus IV., nor the queen herself, and divers others of those times, persons of honour and worth, (with some of which I myself have spoken) have affirmed it for an undoubted truth, did not somewhat more remain (or at least had formerly been) than a single letter of Pius IV., which apparently had reference to matters then of greater privacy. And here I hold it not unworthy a place, that I myself talking sometime with an Italian gentleman (verst in publick affairs) of this offer from the Pope, he made much scruple of believing it; but it being in a place where books were at hand, I shew'd him on what ground I spake, and asked him if he thought men could be devils to write such an odious lie, had it not been so. Well (says he) if this were heard in Rome amongst religious men, it would never gain credit; but with such as have in their hands the maneggi della corte, [the intrigues of the court,] (for that was his expression) it may be held true.

"Indeed, the former author doth not express (as perhaps then not so fit to be publisht) the particulars those articles did contain were

writ with the Abbot's own hand, (which later pens have divulged,) but that, in general, it should be any thing lay in the Pope's power, on her acknowledging his primacy : and certain no other could by him have been propounded to her, nor by her with honour accepted, than that of his allowing the English Liturgy : so that they who agree he did by his agent (according to his letter) make propositions unto her, must instance in some particulars, not dishonourable to herself and kingdom to accept, or allow what these writers affirm to have been them. And I have seen, and heard weighty considerations, why her majesty could not admit her own reformation from Rome ; some with reference to this Church at home, as that, it had been a tacite acknowledgment it could not have reformed itself, which had been contrary to all former precedents ; others to the state of Christendom as it then stood in Scotland, Germany and France : but with this I have not took upon me to meddle here."

---

J.—Page 19.

"The Liturgy," says Camden, in the first year of Elizabeth, "was forthwith brought into the churches in the vulgar tongue ; images were removed without tumult, [and] the oath of supremacy [was] offered to the bishops and others of the ecclesiastical profession. \*

\* \* As many as refused to swear were turned out of their livings, dignities and bishoprics ; and these, he proceeds to say, amounted in all to 177, the fourteen bishops included." Now, from this fact, that out of the 9,400 clergy of the realm, upwards of 9,200 took the oath of supremacy, and acquiesced in the other changes above indicated, I think it fair to infer that the great body of the people continued to adhere to the Church after it was reformed from popery, and to frequent its services as before. The same may also be inferred from what Camden adds soon after : "Thus was religion in England changed, whilst all Christendom admired that it was wrought so easily and without commotion. But, indeed, it was no sudden change (which is never lightly endured), but slow and by degrees. For (to repeat summarily what I have said before) the Romish religion stood a full month and more, after the death of Queen Mary, in the same state as it was before. The 27th of December it was permitted that the Epistle, Gospels, Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Litany should be used in the vulgar tongue. The 22d of March, when the estates of the realm were assembled, by the renewing of a law of Edward VI., was granted the whole use of the Lord's Supper, to wit, under both kinds. The 24th of June, by authority of an act

"concerning the uniformity of Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments,' the sacrifice of the Mass was abolished, and the liturgy in the English tongue established. In the month of July the oath of supremacy was ministered to the bishops and others: and in August images were removed out of the churches, broken or burnt." Thus it appears that the most important of the changes were, one after another, "permitted" and "granted," as if in compliance with the wishes of the people, and that they were acquiesced in by the bishops, who did not revolt until the tender of the oath of supremacy, which, however, five of them, viz., Heath, Bonner, Tonstall, Bayne, and Bourne had taken twice before, viz., under Henry VIII. and Edward VI. All this, combined with the gradual nature of the changes, makes it so apparent, that the mass of the people remained in the Church, that there is little need of direct evidence in support of the fact. Some such evidence, however, I proceed to adduce:

First, I give the declaration of Bramhall (*Just Vindication*, vol. i., p. 248), who was born in the same century: "For divers years," he says, "in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, there was no recusant known in England; but even they who were most addicted to Roman opinions, yet frequented our churches and public assemblies, and did join with us in the use of the same prayers and divine offices, without any scruple, until they were prohibited by a Papal Bull, merely for the interest of the Roman Court."

The Roman titular Bishop of Chalcedon having affirmed that the statement was false, Bramhall replies: "I said, that 'for divers years in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign there were no recusants known in England, until papists were prohibited by a Bull to join with us in our public form of serving God.' This he saith is most false. If it be so, I am more sorry; it was before my time. But I have no reason to believe it to be false. If I had the use of such books as I desire, I should show great authors for it; and as it is, I shall produce some not to be contemned, who say not much less. First, I cite a treatise printed at London, by John Day, about the time when Pius V.'s Bull was published against Queen Elizabeth, called "The Disclosing of the Great Bull that roared at my Lord Bishop's Gate," with a "Declaratory Addition" to the same:—"In hope of the success of this Bull, a number of papists that sometimes did communicate with us, or at the least come ordinarily to our public prayers, have of late forborne." With which author Mr. Camden agreeth, who saith, that "the more modest papists did foresee a heap of miseries hanging over their heads, by the means of this Bull, who

formerly could exercise their own religion securely enough within their own private houses, or else, without any scruple of conscience, were content to go to Church to hear the English service." The reason of this indifferency and compliance is set down by one of their own authors, because the queen, "to remove, as much as might be, all scruples out of the people's heads, and to make them think that the same service and religion continued still," &c., "provided that in the Common Prayer Book there should be some part of the old frame still upheld," &c., "by which dextrous management of affairs the common people were instantly lulled asleep and complied to every thing." (*Bramhall's Works*, vol. ii., pp. 245, 246.)

"But hear," says Bishop Andrewes (*Tortura Torti*, p. 149), who was chaplain in ordinary to Elizabeth, and who had just before remarked, "All who remember the first eleven years of Queen Elizabeth, will declare that never was any period more mild and gentle than that;" "hear," he says, "the Jesuit himself, Philopatrus, who, in other respects one of our revilers, but constrained by the force of truth, thus addresses the queen, in respect to the beginning of her reign: "While in the beginning of your reign, you dealt somewhat mildly with the Catholics; while yet you did not treat them with great violence, nor greatly urge any either to participation of your sect, or to a denial of the ancient faith, all things seemed to proceed in a pretty tranquil course; no great complaints were heard; no remarkable dissention or opposition was manifested, and some there were, who (although the thing was wrong), in order to please and gratify you, frequented your churches in body at least, though their heart was not there." "Here," continues Andrewes, "you read, painted in Jesuit ink, the beginnings of the reign which you calumniate. But, observe, that it is envy itself which utters these words, and that, therefore, the less they express, the more they mean. And yet you hear even from him \* \* \* 'that there was no great dissention,' and that even of those who were Romanists in heart, there were some that actually united in the prayers and Divine offices of the Reformed Church." \*

\* Audi Philopatrum ipsum Jesuitam, insignem alioqui convitiatorem, sed veritatis vi victum, Reginam de Regni sui initijs sic alloquentem : Dum initio Regni tui mitius aliquantò cum Catholicis ageres, dum nullum adhuc vehementissime urgeres, nullum admodum premeres, vel ad sectæ tuæ participationem, vel fidei antiquæ abnegationem, omnia sane tranquilliore cursu incedere videbantur, nec audiebantur magnæ querelæ, nec insignis aliqua dissensio aut repugnantia cernebatur, nec deerant (quamquam male) qui Ecclesias vestras, ut vobis placerent ac gratificarentur, corpore saltem, etsi non animo frequentabant. Legis hic, Jesuitico atramento depicta, quæ tu tum sæva calumniaris Regni Principia.

To these I will add the testimony of one whose veracity is unquestionable, and who speaks of the matters that happened almost within his own recollection. Lord Coke, in the case of Garnet, says: "The coming of this Garnet into England (which very act was a treason), was about twenty years past, viz., in July, 1586, in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of the late queen, of famous and blessed memory; whereas the year before, viz., the twenty-seventh year of Elizabeth, there was a statute made, whereby it was treason for any, who was made a Romish priest, by any authority from the see of Rome, sithence the first year of her reign, to come into her dominion: which statute the Romanists calumniate as a bloody, cruel, unjust, and a new upstart law, and abuse that place of our Saviour, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee,' Mat. xxiii., 37., to that purpose. But, indeed, it is both mild, merciful and just, and grounded upon the ancient fundamental laws of England. For (as hath already in the former arraignments been touched) before the Bull of impious Pius Quintus, in the eleventh year of the queen, wherein her majesty was excommunicated and deposed, and all they accursed who should yield obedience unto her, there were no recusants in England, all came to church, (howsoever popishly inclined, or persuaded in most points) to the same Divine service we now use; but thereupon, presently, they refused to assemble in our churches, or join with us in public service, not for conscience of anything there done, against which they might justly except out of the Word of God, but because the Pope had excommunicated and deposed her majesty, and cursed those who should obey her; and so upon this Bull ensued open rebellion in the north, and many garboils. But see the event: now most miserable in respect of this Bull was the state of Romish recusants, for either they must be hanged for treason, in resisting their lawful sovereign, or cursed for yielding due obedience unto her majesty. And, therefore, of this Pope it was said by some of his own favorites, that he was *Homo pius et doctus, sed nimis credulus*; a holy and learned man, but over credulous, for that he was informed and believed that the strength of the Catholics in England was such as was able to have resisted the queen. But

At tu, audire te hic existima loquentem invidiam ipsam; puta autem minus hic dici, plus intelligi. Audis tamen, vel ab eo neminem admodum tum pressum, non magnas tum querelas, non insignem aliquam dissensionem extitisse: non ergo ita tum refertos carceres, non tot Episcopos, tot nobiles, fortunis omnibus exutos, actos in exilium, carceri perpetuo mancipatos. Crede saltem huic testi; inimicus homo est, nihil in gratiam dicit: crede (inquam) vel inimico huic homini, & de Regina posthæc obnutesce.

when the Bull was found to take such an effect, then was there a dispensation given, both by Pius Quintus himself, and Gregory XIII., that all Catholics might show their outward obedience to the queen : *ad redimendam vexationem et ad ostendendam externam obedientiam*; but with these cautions and limitations: 1. *Rebus sic stantibus*; things to stand as they did. 2. *Donec publica bullæ executio fieri possit*; which is to say: They must grow into strength, until they were able to give the queen a mate, that the public execution of the Bull might take place.

“And all this was confessed by Garnet under his own hand, and now again openly confessed at the bar.” (*Hargrave’s State Trials. Trial of Garnet.*)

To which I may further add the following note from Gibbon’s “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,” vol. ii., p. 203, (Harper, 1826:) “In the beginning of the last century, [that is, (for Gibbon wrote in the eighteenth century) about thirty years after the publication of Pius V.’s bull] the Papists of England were only a *thirtieth*, and the Protestants of France only a *fifteenth* part of the respective nations to whom their spirit and power were a constant object of apprehension. See the relations which Bentivoglio, (who was then Nuncio at Brussels, and afterwards cardinal,) transmitted to the Court of Rome. (*Relazione*, tom. ii., pp. 211, 241.) Bentivoglio was curious, well informed, but somewhat partial.”

---

#### K.—Page 20.

By way of introduction to the Bull of Pius V., excommunicating and deposing Elizabeth, and stirring up her subjects to revolt, I beg leave to offer to the reader a brief statement, compiled from unquestionable authorities, which throws light on its origin, and proves it to be but one of a series of measures, (of which the reader will form his own opinion), by which the Roman see sought to re-establish its supremacy in England.

There is a Life of Pius V., written by *Hieronymo Catena*, and printed at Rome, A.D. 1588, with the privilege of Sixtus V. Camden, in his Annals of Elizabeth, having referred to Catena as “an author for his faithfulness made free of the city of Rome, and Secretary to Cardinal Alexandrino, Pius V.’s nephew, gives a pretty long extract from this

work, from which I shall quote what chiefly relates to my present purpose.

"Pius V.," says Catena, "being inflamed with zeal for restoring the Romish religion in England, and depriving Queen Elizabeth of her kingdom, since he could not have an Apostolic Nuncio, or any public person to carry on these matters, procured one Robert Ridolpho, a gentleman of Florence (who lived in England under color of merchandizing), to animate men's minds to work the destruction of Queen Elizabeth, which he diligently performed, not only among the Catholics, but also with some Protestants, who in this conspired together, some out of private hatred to those that aspired to the Crown, and others affecting innovations. Whilst these things were privately acting, there happened a difference between the Spaniard and Queen Elizabeth, about some money that was intercepted. From hence the Pope taking occasion, persuaded the Spaniard to assist the conspirators in England against Queen Elizabeth, that so he might more securely carry on his affairs in the Netherlands, and the Romish religion might be restored in Britain."

Having mentioned the intrigues of the Pope to bring the French into the scheme, and some other particulars of the conspiracy, Catena proceeds: "The Pope, to forward the matter, published a Bull, deposed the queen from her crown, and absolved her subjects from all their oaths of obedience, sending printed copies thereof to Ridolpho to be dispersed all over England. Hereupon the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland took up arms against their prince; who soon after, for lack of money, withdrew themselves into Scotland. Norfolk and others were committed to custody, among whom was Ridolpho, whom the Pope had commanded to furnish the conspirators with an hundred and fifty thousand crowns; which, being kept in prison, he could not do.

"But, foreasmuch as the queen could not discover the depth of the conspiracy, he with the rest was let out of prison, and then distributed those crowns among the conspirators; who sent him to the Pope to give him notice that all things were prepared and in readiness at home, against Queen Elizabeth, and to interest the Spaniard forthwith to assist them out of the Low Countries. The Pope commended the enterprise," etc.

Catena goes on to state that the Pope sent Ridolpho to the Spaniard, under another pretence, and to Portugal with instructions. "The Spaniard he urged to aid the conspirators, and the more effectually to persuade him, he promised to go himself to their succor, and,

if need were, to mortgage all the goods of the Apostolic see, chalices, crosses, and holy vestments. As for difficulty, there was none at all in it if he would send Chapini Vitelli out of the Netherlands with an army into England; which the Spaniard with all alacrity commanded forthwith to be done, and the Pope himself provided money in a readiness in the Netherlands." (See *Camden's Eliz.*, Anno 1572, p. 180, of the 3d Eng. edit., A.D. 1675.)

This secret distribution of the Bull by Ridolpho appears to have been about a year before it was placarded by Felton on the palace gate of the Bishop of London. For the Bull was not made public in England till the year after it was concocted at Rome; to which delay, by the by, Saunders (a Roman author of that age), in his treatise on the Visible Monarchy of the Church, ascribes the ruin of the hopeful rebellion. For having remarked that "Pius V., the chief bishop, A.D. 1569, sent a reverend priest, Nicholas Morton, an Englishman, into England, to declare to certain noblemen, by the Apostolic authority, that Elizabeth, who was then in possession, was a heretic; and that for that reason she had fallen from all dominion and power, and was to be regarded by them as a heathen, and that they were not to be compelled to obey her laws or mandates;" he adds, "By which denunciation many noblemen were led to attempt the liberation of their brethren, and they hoped, certainly, that all Catholics would have assisted them with all their strength; but, although the matter happened otherwise than they expected, BECAUSE ALL THE CATHOLICS KNEW NOT THAT ELIZABETH WAS DECLARED TO BE A HERETIC, yet the counsels and intents of these noblemen were to be praised!"

It will be seen by the above extract from Catena, that the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, on the failure of their abortive insurrection, sent to the Pope to give him notice that all things were in readiness for a new outbreak. One is naturally desirous to know in what terms the pretended Father of Christendom responded to these two promising sons; and it so happens that, in the *Life of Pius V.*, by Gabutius, printed at Antwerp, 1640, we have the identical letter which his Holiness addressed to them. From this letter, (the whole of which may be seen in Gibson's Collection, vol. 3d, tit. xiii.) which is addressed "To our beloved sons, Thomas, Earl of Northumberland, and Charles, Earl of Westmoreland, in England," and dated at "Rome, at St. Peter's, under the Fisher's Ring, the 20th day of February, 1570," I am content to make the following extract:

"Our Lord JESUS CHRIST hath by you (men dear to us, and eminent as well by the study of Catholic piety as by nobleness of birth,) determined, peradventure, to renew and confirm the ancient

union of the Roman Church with that kingdom [England]; and therefore hath infused into you that mind most worthy of the zeal of your Catholic faith, that you should attempt to redeem back that kingdom (delivered from the most vile servitude of a woman's lust) to the ancient obedience of this Holy Roman See. Which pious and religious endeavour of your minds we commend (as is fit) with just praises in the Lord, and giving it that our blessing which you desire, we do with the benignity which becomes us, receive your honors flying to the protection of us, and of this Holy See, to whose authority they subject themselves; exhorting you in the Lord, and with all possible earnestness of our mind, entreating you to persevere constantly in this your so exceeding good will and laudable purpose.

\* \* \* But if, in asserting the Catholic faith and authority of this Holy See, you should suffer death, and your blood be spilt; it would be much better for the confession of God, to fly by the compendium of a glorious death to life eternal, than living basely and ignominiously, to serve the lust of an impotent woman with the loss of your souls."

In effect this Roman "Saint" (for Pius V. was canonized, A. D. 1712) adds a ninth to the eight benedictions of the gospel: "Blessed are they who for my sake shall die as traitors on earth, for they shall be crowned as martyrs in heaven."

The policy here marked out was not peculiar to Pius V. Pope Gregory XIII. afterwards renewed the same Bull of excommunication and deposition against Elizabeth, probably at the time when he was intriguing to procure the kingdom of Ireland for his base-born son. (See Camden's *Eliz.*, Anno 1578). It was again renewed by Pope Sixtus V.; who, "that he might not seem to be wanting to the cause, sending Cardinal Allen, an Englishman, into the Low Countries, renewed the bulls declaratory of Pius Quintus and Gregory Thirteenth, excommunicated the queen, dethroned her, absolved her subjects from all allegiance, and published his crusade in print, as it were against Turks and Infidels, wherein, out of the treasury of the Church, he granted plenary indulgences to all that gave him help and assistance."

Strange, that in the face of these and other like facts of history, there are men even now to be found, who hope that the Roman see may become a central and controlling power among the nations of the earth, for harmonizing their disputes by force of reason, and preventing appeals to the sword! At least I have heard the vision fondly confessed, not indeed by Romanists or Churchmen, but among the amiable descendants of the Puritans in the bosom of New-England. I suppose, because, having pricked the bladder of *Peace Societies*, they were impatient to soar upward in a new balloon of grander dimensions.

But I am detaining the reader from the Bull of Pius, (the gospel according to the papacy,) which I transcribe from Camden's Elizabeth, Anno 1570; a Bull which has never been revoked, and which is, therefore, as much the act of the Roman see to-day, as when it was first issued.

... 3

PIUS, BISHOP, SERVANT TO GOD'S SERVANTS,

*for a future memorial of the matter.*

"He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power, in heaven and in earth, hath committed His one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone upon earth, namely, to Peter, the chief of the apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be by him governed with plenary authority. Him alone hath he made prince over all people and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant and build; that he may preserve his faithful people (knit together with the band of charity) in the unity of the spirit, and present them spotless and unblamable to their Saviour. In discharge of which function, we, who are, by God's goodness, called to the government of the aforesaid Church, do spare no pains, labouring with all earnestness, that unity and the Catholic religion (which the Author thereof hath, for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be tossed with so great afflictions) might be preserved sincere. But the number of the ungodly hath gotten such power, that there is now no place in the whole world left which they have not essayed to corrupt with their most wicked doctrines; and, amongst others, Elizabeth, the pretended Queen of England, the servant of wickedness, lendeth thereunto her helping hand, with whom, as in a sanctuary, the most pernicious persons have found a refuge. This very woman having seized on the kingdom, and monstrously usurped the place of Supreme Head of the Church in all England, and the chief authority and jurisdiction thereof, hath again reduced the said kingdom into a miserable and ruinous condition, which was so lately reclaimed to the Catholic faith and thriving condition.

"For having by strong hand prohibited the exercise of the true religion, which Mary, the lawful queen of famous memory, had by the help of this See restored, after it had been formerly overthrown by Henry the Eighth, a revolter therefrom, and following and embracing the errors of heretics, she hath changed the royal council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it up with obscure men, being heretics; suppressed the embracers of the Catholic faith; constituted lewd preachers and ministers of impiety; abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, choice of meats, unmarried life, and the Catholic rites and ceremonies; commanded books to be read through the whole realm, containing manifest heresy, and appointed impious rites and institutions, by herself entertained and observed according to the prescript of Calvin, to be likewise observed by her subjects; presumed to eject bishops, parsons of churches,

and other Catholic priests, out of their churches and benefices, and to bestow them and other church-livings upon heretics, and to determine of Church causes; prohibited the prelates, clergy and people to acknowledge the Church of Rome, or obey the precepts and canonical sanctions thereof; compelled most of them to condescend to wicked laws, and to abjure the authority and obedience of the Bishop of Rome, and to acknowledge her to be sole Lady in temporal and spiritual matters, and this by oath; imposed penalties and punishments upon those which obeyed not, and exacted them of those which persevered in the unity of the faith and their obedience aforesaid; cast the Catholic prelates and rectors of churches into prison, where many of them, being worn out with long languishing and sorrow, miserably ended their lives. All which things being so manifest and notorious to all nations, and by the serious testimony of very many so substantially proved, that there is no place at all left for excuse, defence, or evasion: We, seeing that impieties and wicked actions are multiplied, one upon another, as also that the persecution of the faithful and affliction for religion groweth every day heavier and heavier, through the instigation and by the means of the said Elizabeth; and since we understand her heart to be so hardened and obdurate, that she hath not only contemned the godly requests and admonitions of Catholic princes, concerning her cure and conversion, but also hath not so much as suffered the Nuncios of this See to cross the seas for this purpose into England, are constrained of necessity to betake ourselves of the weapons of justice against her, being heartily grieved and sorry that we are compelled thus to punish one to whose ancestors the whole state of Christendom hath been so much beholden. Being, therefore, supported with His authority, whose pleasure it was to place us (though unable for so great a burthen) in this supreme throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth as being a heretic and favourer of heretics; and her adherents in the matters aforesaid to have incurred the sentence of excommunication, and to be cut off from the unity of the Body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and also, the nobility, subjects, and people of said kingdom, and all others who have in any sort sworn unto her, to be forever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance and obedience; and we also do, by authority of these presents, absolve them, and do deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things before named. And we do command and charge all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her orders, mandates and laws; and those which shall do the contrary, we do include them in the like sentence of anathema. And because it would be a difficult matter to convey these presents to all places wheresoever it shall be needful: our will is, that the copies thereof, under a public notary's hand, and sealed with the seal of an ecclesiastical prelate, or of his court, shall carry altogether the same credit with all men, judicially and

extrajudicially, as these presents should do if they were exhibited or showed.

“Given at Rome, at St. Peter’s, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord, one thousand five hundred and sixty-nine, the fifth of the calends of March, and of our Popedom the fifth year.  
CÆ. GLORIERIUS.

---

L.—Page 20.

It is well known that a number of Romish priests were put to death under the reign of Elizabeth: the pretence of the Romanists is, that they suffered for conscience; and there is a book entitled “Missionary Priests,” intended to glorify them as a part of the noble army of martyrs who have fallen as victims to the rage of heathen persecution. The fact is, however, that these poor creatures were executed for treason, for exciting seditions in the state, and for plotting the deposition and death of the queen, under the authority and direction of the Bishop of Rome. For proof of this, see the trial of Garnet and others of the same stamp, in the State Trials.

“The execution of justice in England, not for religion but for treason,” is the title of a paper which was prepared and published under the direction of Burleigh, secretary to Queen Elizabeth, and may, therefore, be regarded as authority for the transactions of that reign. The occasion of its publication was to disabuse foreign princes and states of the false impression which they had received from certain persons, who, according to their own story, had been compelled to leave their native England and Ireland, on account of their attachment to the religion of Rome, and their maintenance of the Pope’s authority; and its purpose is to show the true character of these men, and the utter falsehood of their representations. In this paper, Burleigh refers to many of the bishops of Queen Mary’s time, then living, and to great numbers both of clergymen and laymen known to adhere to the Roman religion, and to the Pope’s supremacy as of Divine right, who had never been molested by the State. “And if, then,” he proceeds, “it be inquired for what cause these others have of late suffered death, it is truly to be answered, that none at all are impeached for treason, to the danger of their life, but such as do obstinately maintain the contents of the Pope’s Bull aforementioned, which do import that her majesty is

not the lawful Queen of England—the first and highest point of treason; and that all her subjects are discharged of their oaths of obedience—another high point of treason; and all warranted to disobey her and her laws—a third and a very large point of treason.”

The same document having referred to the notorious evil lives of some who had been plotting against the Government, adds: “It liked the Bishop of Rome, as in favor of their treasons, not to color their offences as themselves openly pretended to do, for avoiding of common shame of the world, but flatly to animate them to continue their former evil purposes, that is, to take arms against their lawful queen—to invade her realm with foreign forces—to pursue all her good subjects, and their native countries, with fire and sword,” etc.; and these, it continues, “thus acting under the banner of Rome, \* \* have justly suffered death, not by force of any new laws established either for religion or against the Pope’s supremacy, as the slanderous libellers would have it seem to be, but by the ancient temporal laws of the realm, namely, by the laws of Parliament, made in King Edward III.’s time, about the year of our Lord, 1330, which is above two hundred years and more past, when the Bishop of Rome and Popes were suffered to have their authority ecclesiastical in this realm, as they had in many other countries.”

This paper of Burleigh furnishes documentary proof of a fact (of which, indeed, sufficient evidence of another kind may be had elsewhere) which may in this connexion be submitted to the attention and judgment of the reader.

The case was this: The Bull commanded the subjects of the queen not to obey her; and she being excommunicated, all that did obey fell under the same anathema with herself. Here then was a strait: if the Romanists obeyed the queen, they incurred the Pope’s curse; if they disobeyed her, they were in danger of the laws of their country. What, then, were they to do? What they did do was this: they brought the case to the notice of the Roman see, and requested that, until the time should come when the Bull could be publicly executed, it should be so understood as to bind the queen and the heretics, but not to bind the Romanists; so that the latter might, with a good conscience, avail themselves of the protection of the laws, for the purpose of attempting to subvert them, and until their attempts should succeed. So careful were they to strain out the gnat of disobedience to the Bishop of Rome, while they swallowed the poison of treason to their country. And here is the sanction of their conduct by the Church of Rome:

*“Facultates Concessæ, pp. Roberto Parsonio et Edmundo Campiano, pro Anglia, die 14 Aprilis, 1580.*

“Petatur a summo Domino nostro, explicatio Bullæ declaratoriæ per Pium Quintum contra Elizabetham & ei adherentes, quam Catholici cupiunt intelligi hoc modo, ut obliget semper illam & hæreticos, Catholicos vera nullo modo obliget, rebus sic stantibus, sed tum deinum, quando publica ejusdem Bullæ executio fieri poterit.” Then followed many other petitions of faculties for their further authorities, which are not needful for this purpose to be recited. But in the end followeth this sentence, as an answer of the Pope’s : “Has prædictas gratias concessit Summus Pontifex patri Roberto Parsonio & Edmundo Campiano in Angliam profecturis, die 14 Aprilis, 1580. Præsente patre Oliverio Manarco assistente.”

The English of which Latin sentences is as followeth :

*“Faculties granted to the two Fathers, Robert Parsons and Edmund Campian, for England, the 14th of April, 1580.*

“Let it be asked or required of our most holy Lord, the explication or meaning of the Bull declaratory made by Pius the Fifth against Elizabeth, and such as do adhere to or obey her ; which Bull the Catholicks desire to be understood in this manner, that the same Bull shall always bind her and the hereticks, but the Catholicks it shall by no means bind, as matters or things do now stand or be, but hereafter, when the publick execution of that Bull may be had or made.”

Then, in the end, the conclusion was thus added :

“The highest pontiff or bishop granted these foresaid graces to Fathers Robert Parsons and Edmund Campian, who are now to take their journeys into England, the fourteenth day of April, in the year of our Lord 1580, being present the Father Oliverius Manarke, Assistant.”

I learn from one of the writers in Gibson, that this paper of Burleigh received an answer at the time ; and as the answer was written by a Cardinal, and ought to carry some weight, the reader may not be displeased to see the account of it given by the author referred to : “Cardinal Allen,” he says, “in his Answer to the Treatise of the Lord Treasurer, entitled, ‘The Execution of Justice in England,’ though he confesses the matter-of-fact, as it hath been above related, yet positively asserts that Campian and the rest of the priests, the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, and all that had suffered for putting the Bull of Pius V. in execution, were martyrs, chap. 1 and 2 ; that the priests and Catholick brethren had behaved themselves discreetly, and nothing seditiously, in their several answers to the articles proposed to them concerning that Bull, cap. 3 and 4 ; that it is a part of Catholick doctrine, that heretical princes,

being excommunicated by the Pope, are to be deprived, and that their subjects are thereupon absolved from their allegiance; and that princes, being thus deposed, their subjects may take up arms against them for heresy, or for any other cause for which the Pope shall declare that they deserve deprivation, cap. 5 and 6; that such wars for religion are not only just, but honorable; and endeavors to prove those his assertions of the Pope's power and superiority over kings, in case of heresy, apostacy, or other like, to be agreeable to God's Word, and not treasonable nor undutiful to any prince or State in the world, p. 77. He vindicates the authority of the Lateran Canons, etc., and brings several instances from Gregory VII. downwards, of princes deprived, as he contends, justly, particularly King John and King Henry II., cap. 6 and 7. He threatens, p. 181, etc., utter ruin to the queen and her adherents, from the Pope and Catholick princes confederate against her, unless they returned to the unity of the See Apostolick, or granted the Roman Catholics a toleration, cap. 8 and 9. And in the conclusion. If the Roman Catholicks would do us the favor to reprint this book (for now it is very rarely to be met with), all that read it might there plainly enough find the reasons why the penal laws against them were then, as they are now, thought so unjust and cruel by that party, and how much their arguments and pretences for toleration, in some late treatises, are different from those they made use of in that age, as if they had altered their principles as to the deposing power and extirpation of all hereticks and rebels to the Apostolick See, which this Cardinal, and the rest of our English seminary priests, in those days, maintained not only to be lawful, but decreed in several General Councils as articles of faith."

It is but fair to add, that these principles were not embraced by all the Romanists of that day. Indeed, the secular priests and the Jesuits had a sort of family quarrel (Camden, who personally knew many of them, hints his belief that the quarrel was a sham, and that the parties were at heart agreed), in the course of which the former berate the latter roundly for their dishonest and treasonable practices, and profess their affection for the queen, and their gratitude for the kind treatment they had received from her government.

These notes are running to an inordinate length; but having exhibited at some length the conduct of the one party of these distracted schismatics, it seems but fair to give a taste of the wholesome correction which they received from the other. This was administered in a paper entitled, "Important Considerations, which ought to move all

true and sound CATHOLICKS, who are not wholly jesuited, to acknowledge, without all equivocations, ambiguities or shiftings, that the proceedings of her majesty, and of the State with them, since the beginning of her highness's reign, have been both mild and merciful. Published by sundry of us, the secular priests, in dislike of many treatises, letters, and reports which have been written and made in divers places to the contrary, together with our opinion," etc. This brochure, which is addressed to "Right honorable, worshipful, well-beloved lords, ladies, earls, countesses, viscounts, viscountesses, barons, baronesses, batchelors, virgins, married, single," is a tumid affair. I will quote but one passage, and it shall be from the peroration: "That, therefore, you shall not have cause to curse us, nor your innocent blood to cry against us, together with the Jesuites that have already brought you into a fool's paradise of zealous aspires, nor your posterity bewail our silence, whiles any English blood remains alive; this is the cause of our breach, and herein have we, do we, and will we be disobedient to death. Never shall our adversaries be able to upbraid us, or stain our priestly function and Catholick profession with a Calvinian, or a Buchananian, or Cartwrightian, or a huff-muff Puritanian popularity, which is the only mark the Jesuites aim at. Never shall her majesty nor the State suspect us for any bill exhibited by us or our means, in her High Court of Parliament, for any alteration and change of the ancient laws and customs, which both Puritans and Jesuites do greedily gape after and labor for. Never shall any prince, people, or nation, point at us for traitors, unnatural, disloyal, false-hearted, unkind, ungrateful Englishmen; laugh us to scorn, and worthily reject us, after they had the sack and spoil of our country by our means. Never shall all the drifts, plots and devices the Jesuites, or yet the devil himself can invent, bring us to be in the predicament of treason, treachery, ambitious aspires and conspiracies with them. Never shall the Catholick Church or commonwealth of England find so wicked a member as a Wolsey, a Parsons, a Creswell, a Garnet, a Blackwell, among those whom you (dear Catholicks) account of as reprobates, malecontents, atheists, and of God forsaken. Never shall the child of any peer, noble, or lord, of or in this land, say, a secular priest (termed indiscreetly by you, dear Catholics, one of the faction) was cause of my ruin, and overthrow of my honorable father, house, blood and name; which may be said, and will be proved, by sundry examples against the Puritans and Jesuites, as well conjunct as apart. Never shall any royal lady of the court, maid of honor, or damsel of rare aspect," etc.

But in what light was this party of the schismatics regarded by the see of Rome, the approbation of which was the great object of their "aspires?" They could not hope for much if the Jesuits were in favor, and they got less than they hoped for, if we may take the word of Widdrington, one of their side and a contemporary, who (as quoted in the *Jesuites Behaviour*, p. 156, *Gibson's Preservative*, vol. 3) relates: "That Queen Elizabeth having discovered that she was minded to show favor to as many Roman Catholick priests as should give her assurance of their loyalty, and to exempt them from suffering the penalties of her laws, some well-meaning men went to Rome to carry the good news, as they thought it; but when they were come thither, they found themselves much mistaken: instead of thanks, they were reproached by the governing party, and branded with the name of schismaticks, spies and rebels to the See Apostolick: and, moreover, there was one of that party compiled a treatise in Italian, to advise his Holiness that it was not good and profitable to the Catholick cause, that any liberty or toleration should be granted by the State of England to Catholicks."

---

M.—Page 22.

Take for instance the story of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, which, as collected by Bishop Hicke out of the offices of the Roman Church, is in brief this: When the Virgin died, all the apostles, wherever dispersed, were suddenly caught up in the air and brought to Jerusalem. When there assembled, a vision of angels appeared unto them, and the vision was attended with the sweet psalmody of the heavenly powers; in which the Blessed Virgin resigned her soul in a glorious manner into the hands of God, and the angels and apostles continuing to sing together, her body was carried out and put in a coffin, and buried at Gethsemane, where the angels continued to sing three days together. At the end of three days, Thomas, who was not with the apostles when she died, came to Jerusalem, and being desirous to worship the body of the Blessed Virgin, they went to Gethsemane to take it up; but when they had opened the grave, and the coffin, to their great astonishment there was no body there; and they all agreed in this opinion, that it had pleased the Word of God and the Lord of Glory, who took his body out of the Blessed Virgin, not to suffer her to see corruption; but to do her the honor to translate it into heaven, before the common and universal resurrection.

An annual feast, called the Feast of the Assumption, is celebrated in the Roman Church, on the 15th of August, in commemoration of this fabulous occurrence ; which feast, and the offices relating to it, were abolished by our Reformers. It is from the office for the Assumption in the Roman Breviary that the above account is compiled, and whoever will be at the pains to verify it, will see that it is not exaggerated, but the reverse.

If the authorities of the Roman Church really believe with the old mystics and modern infidels, that the story of our Blessed Lord is a myth contrived for the edification of the people, but devoid of historic truth, why do they not honestly say so ? But if they believe in the literal truth of the gospel, why do they retain this transparent fable in the offices of their Church ? For consistency's sake, they should either declare our Lord's Ascension a fable, or else abolish the Feast of the Assumption.

"I cannot but observe here," says Bishop Hicckes, (*Speculum B. Virginis*, p. 88.) after having given the particulars of this myth about the Virgin Mary, "how well the story of her Assumption is framed to answer to our Lord's Ascension, and how Thomas was absent at this meeting of the apostles, just as he was at that in which Jesus stood in the midst of them, and shewed unto them his hands and his side. Poor, unfortunate apostle ! thou art always tardy, and canst never come in time to meet the rest of thy brethren. But perhaps he was at the Indies, and had a greater journey than the rest, who were nearer to Jerusalem. I am as content as any man to admit this excuse ; and if you further desire to know what death the Blessed Virgin died of, the author of the Contemplations will tell you that she died of a spiritual fever, into which she fell through a seraphick vehemency of Divine love, which inflamed her blood, and set her sacred heart on fire ; and that her assumption was in this manner : Her glorious soul, saith he, descended from her imperial seat in heaven, accompanied with seraphims and chiefest saints, and re-assumed her sacred body, and ascended with it again, and placed it above all the troops of the blessed. Being ascended in body and soul into heaven, she was seated on a throne above all seraphims, next to the most glorious Trinity, and inaugurated, proclaimed and acknowledged queen of all pure creatures, and at her coronation she was clothed with the sun, and had the moon for her foot-stool, and was crowned with an imperial crown of twelve stars. And truly, in some of her offices, the 1st verse of the 12th chapter of the Revelations is applied to

her, where it is written, 'And there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars.'"

---

[Owing to the cancelling of a note and a consequent change in the lettering, the following note was accidentally overlooked, and a mistake made in one of the references. The note relates to a passage on p. 26, (where the reference is erroneously made to be "D.") and is here inserted in its proper place.]

MM.—*Page 26.*

As intimated in the text, the title "Head of the Church" was accorded to the first king of England who assumed it, by his Roman Catholic bishops; to which may be added, that the title, after being sanctioned by Romanists, was, on the completion of the Reformation, laid aside by Protestants, because, from a feeling of reverence, they would not apply to an earthly potentate the appellation which is commonly given, though in a totally different sense, to our Saviour. The title was first assumed by Henry VIII., and retained by Edward VI., and by Queen Mary also, during part of her reign; the very act which was passed in the first year of her reign to restore Popery, (entitled "An Acte for the Repeale of certayne Statutes made in the time of the Raigne of Kinge Edwarde the Syxthe,") styling the queen "The Supreme Head of the Church of England and Ireland." The title, however, (by which no more was meant than a civil or political headship, such as that of Saul, who is called (1 Sam. xv. 17) "the head of the tribes of Israel") was discontinued under Elizabeth, and has never since been resumed; though, of course, the thing intended by it is retained as the just prerogative of the crown. Indeed, the restoration of this power (which had been usurped by the Bishop of Rome), was the necessary consequence of restraining appeals to Rome, of determining causes of justice and disputes of law within the realm, and of reducing the ecclesiastics (then shielded by the canon law) to a just accountability to the laws of the land. Of the necessity of restoring this power to the crown, there need be no further proof than is afforded by the Bull of Paul III., summoning the king of England (Henry VIII.) to appear within ninety days at Rome, and stand to the judgment of that Court, on his alleged delinquencies.

This Bull, which is entitled, "Damnatio et Excommunicatio Henrici VIII., Regis Angliæ, ejusque fautorum & complicum, cum aliarum

poenarum adjectione," may be seen in full in Burnet's Collection of Records, vol i., p. 166. After some preliminary matters, it sets forth that Henry was not ashamed to publish and compel his subjects to hold certain laws and general constitutions, among which was this, "Quod Romanus Pontifex caput Ecclesiæ & Christi Vicarius non erat, & quod ipse in Anglica Ecclesia supremum caput existebat:" That the Roman Pontiff was not the head of the Church and Vicar of Christ, and that he himself was the Supreme Head of the Church in England. (See Appendix D.) For the rest, suffice it to give the Synopsis of Collier, vol ii., p. 98., of the folio edition.

In this instrument "he gives Bishop Fisher a great character, and styles him a cardinal. He admonishes the king to relinquish his errors, and repent his crimes, summons his highness to appear within ninety days at Rome, either in person or by proxy, and stand to the judgment of that court. And in case of refusal, he was, after the term prefixed, to be excommunicated, and the kingdom put under an interdict. And, upon non-performance of the conditions above mentioned, the subjects are commanded to withdraw their allegiance; all other Christian countries are forbidden the liberties of intercourse and commerce with the English; the ecclesiastics are ordered to depart the kingdom with all expedition; the temporal nobility and gentry to form themselves into an army, and drive the king out of his dominions. And as for foreign kings and princes, they are exhorted in the Lord, as Saunders transcribes it, to treat Henry and his abettors, as rebels to the Church, and undertake a Holy War against them, till they have brought them to recollection and submission to the Apostolic See; and, to disentangle their consciences and encourage them the better, all their alliances, treaties and engagements, of what kind soever, with the king of England, are declared null and void.

"And for the more effectual apprehending of those who stood firm for the king, his Holiness grants Letters of Reprisal to Christendom in general: and thus any body that could seize 'em, might make slaves of their persons, and take their effects for their own use.

"Farther, there's an order directed to all the prelates, to excommunicate the king and his abettors publicly in their churches. And lastly, all persons are laid under the like censure that shall hinder this Bull from being either published or executed. And that the king and his friends might not pretend themselves unacquainted with the Pope's resolution, this instrument was order'd to be fixed on the doors of the principal churches of Tournay, Bruges, and Dunkirk."

Was it not high time for the king to take care of himself, and proclaim himself the head of all matters in his own dominions? As Romanists, however, are accustomed to assert that the kings of England, since the rejection of popery, have claimed that power of juris.

diction which Christ left to the Church, I annex one of the injunctions of Elizabeth, A.D. 1559, the 37th Article of the Church of England, and the corresponding article as it stands appended to our American Prayer Book. On a comparison of them, it will be seen that they are intended merely to assert the supremacy of the law of the land, in Great Britain and the United States, over all classes of men, ecclesiastical and secular, in opposition to the civil and political power, in these countries, of the Bishop of Rome.

*An Admonition to Simple Men deceived by Malicious.*

The queen's majesty being informed, that in certain places of the realm, sundry of her native subjects being called to ecclesiastical ministry of the Church, be by sinister persuasion and perverse construction, induced to find some scruple in the form of an oath, which, by an act of the last Parliament, is prescribed to be required of divers persons for their recognition of their allegiance to her majesty, which certainly never was ever meant, nor by any equity of words or good sense can be thereof gathered: would that all her loving subjects should understand, that nothing was, is, or shall be meant or intended by the same oath, to have any other duty, allegiance, or bond, required by the same oath, than was acknowledged to be due to the most noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth, her majestie's father, or king Edward the Sixth, her Majestie's brother.

And further, her majesty forbiddeth all manner of her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labor to notifie to her loving subjects, how by words of the said oath it may be collected, that the kings or queens of this realm, possessors of the crown, may challenge authority and power of ministry of Divine service in the Church, wherein her said subjects be much abused by such evil disposed persons. For certainly her majesty neither doth nor ever will challenge any authority, than that has been challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth, and king Edward the Sixth, which is, and was of ancient time due to the Imperial Crown of this realm, that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal soever they be, so as no other sovereign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them. And if any person that hath conceived any other sense of the form of the said oath, shall accept the same oath with this interpretation, sense, or meaning, her majesty is well pleased to accept every such in that behalf, as her good and obedient subjects, and shall acquit them of all manner of penalties contained in the said act against such as shall peremptorily or obstinately take the same oath.

*From the 37th Article of the Church of England, entitled, of "Civil Magistrates."*

The queen's majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the queen's majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some dangerous folks to be offended : we give not our princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the injunctions also set forth by Elizabeth our queen, do most plainly testifie ; but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees, committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers.

The same article, as it stands annexed to our American Prayer Book, is entitled and reads as follows :

*Of the Power of the Civil Magistrates.*

"The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal ; but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the gospel, to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted."

---

N.—Page 26.

Reformation, as has been remarked by Dodwell, (Answer to Six Queries, &c., London, A. D. 1688.) may be considered two ways : 1. As preached and imposed under pain of spiritual censures, and of exclusion from the communion of the Church, and a deprivation of all the privileges consequent on that communion ; and this is certainly the right of the Church, and was accordingly practised by the Church of England on its reformation from popery. 2. As enacted as a law of the land, and consequently as urged the same way as other laws are under temporal penalties and external coercion ; and this is, undoubtedly, the right of the secular power. And this was all in which the secular power concerned itself in the reformation.

Of course we are responsible only for the action of the Church, and are not obliged to defend the proceedings of Parliament. But as the

cry of "Parliamentary religion" is one of the common places of the Romanists, it may be as well to add, that the *reformation* from popery by Parliament in the 16th century, proceeded on the same principle as the *imposition* of popery by Parliament in the previous ages. The Church of England has been no more indebted to Parliament in its disbelief and rejection of popery since the Reformation, than it was in the belief and admission of popery before the Reformation. The Church of England first cast popery out of the hearts of the people by a pure gospel, and then the state declared it cast out by law.

If it be said that the magistrate was obliged by the law of the land and the canons of the Church to follow the advice of the greater part of the bishops, the answer is, that the legal right of the bishops to advise the magistrate might be forfeited by their personal misdemeanors, and of this point the magistrate was the judge. And as to canonical right, the bishops that were deprived under Elizabeth (in reference to whom the objection is made) were intruders, who had been thrust upon the Church of England by a foreign jurisdiction, and were striving to uphold a system of doctrine and usage which the Church of England had rejected. Romanists themselves admit, that the greater part of bishops in a particular or national church, may become heretical, and that in such a case the magistrate is not bound to acknowledge their canonical rights, or to heed their censures.

On the subject of this, and the previous note, compare Appendix D.

---

O.—Page 27.

In the ancient state of the Church, when the main body of Christianity was at unity with itself, the word *Catholic*, or *universal*, was applied to the common faith, and to those Christians and Christian churches, wheresoever dispersed, which held the common faith; and thus served to distinguish the faith held in common by the main body of Christians, from the errors of particular men, and the main body itself from all particular divisions founded upon such errors. For example: the main body held to one distinct and consistent faith in the Holy Trinity, and the word *Catholic*, or *universal*, was aptly used to distinguish that faith and the persons who professed it, from the Arians, Macedonians, Sabellians, Nestorians, and others, who either

directly denied, or held opinions which, by necessary consequence, subverted it. The main body held to the doctrine of original sin, which Pelagius and his followers denied; hence the doctrine and its followers were Catholic, while the opposite tenet and its followers were Pelagian. The main body held to episcopacy as Christ's institution, while Aërius rejected it; and hence the former is reputed Catholic, while the latter is known as the heresy of Aërius; and so in other cases.

But when the main body of Christians was divided into the Churches of the East and West, both parts retained the name of Catholic, though either part was schismatical and heretical in the judgment of the other. The Romanists, indeed, would have us believe that the Pope of Rome cut off the Eastern Christians from the communion of Christ; but the Eastern Christians, who are not behind them in magniloquence, are equally positive that their Popes expelled the Western Pope from the true Church, and affixed on him and his followers the brand of heresy and schism.

"Some time since," to give the reader their own account of the schism, "the Pope of Rome, being deceived by the malice of the devil, and falling into strange novel doctrines, revolted from the unity of the holy Church, and was cut off; and it is now like a shattered rag of a sail of the spiritual vessel of the Church, which formerly consisted and was made up of five parts, four of which continue in the same state of unity and agreement: and by these we easily and calmly sail through the ocean of this life, and without difficulty pass over the waves of heresy, till we arrive within the haven of salvation. But he who is the fifth part, being separated from the entire sail, and remaining by himself in a small piece of the torn sheet, is unable to perform his voyage, and therefore we behold him at a distance tossed with constant waves and tempest, till he return to our Catholic, Apostolic, Oriental, immaculate faith, and be reinstated in the sail from whence he was broken off; for this will make him secure, and able to weather the spiritual storms and tempests that beset him. Thus, therefore, the holy Church of Christ with us subsists on four pillars, namely, the four Patriarchs, and continues firm and immovable. The first in order is the Patriarch of Constantinople; the second is the Pope of Alexandria; the third of Antioch; the fourth of Jerusalem."\*

With these differences, however, we are not here concerned, but only with the fact that both sides retained the name of *Catholic*, and

\* See the answer of the Eastern Patriarch to the Nonjuring Bishops. Lathbury's History of Nonjurors, p. 320.

that the word has consequently ceased to be a note or mark to distinguish those who hold the common faith of the ancient Church from heretics and schismatics.

On the state of things prevailing in the ancient Church was founded the direction of Cyril: "If you go into any city, do not inquire for the Church and the house of God; for the heretics say that they have the house of God and the Church; but inquire for the Catholic Church, for this truly is the proper name for that holy Church, which is the mother of us all." Pacian, also, another ancient writer, has prettily remarked—"Christian is my name, and Catholic my surname; by the former I am distinguished from infidels, by the latter from heretics and schismatics." Both these passages are quoted by Bellarmine (and often since by other Romanists) to show that the word *Catholic* is a note of the Church, as distinguished from heretic.

We have seen, however, that in the time in which Cyril and Pacian lived, the word *Catholic* was indeed a note or mark to distinguish the professors of the true faith from heretics, but that at present the case is otherwise. For it is notorious that Christians of the Eastern and Western Churches are both called Catholics, and yet each believe the other to be involved in heresy and schism. A Romanist following the direction of Cyril, among the Orientals, would be directed to a Church which he would account heretical; and without some more distinctive appellation than the name and surname assigned to him by Pacian, he would inevitably be confounded with those who, in the judgment of his Pope, are heretics and schismatics.

"It was, therefore," says Field, (On the Church, book 2, chap. 9,) "more than ordinarie impudencie in Bellarmine to affirme that the name of a Catholike is a note of true Catholike profession, when he knew it to be common to such as himselfe pronounceth heretikes. And it is yet more intolerable that he sayth there is no heresie which receiveth not her name from some particular man, the author and beginner of it: and that whosoever are named after the names of men are undoubtedly heretikes. For of what man had the *Apostolici* their name, whose author and first beginner was never knowen. (as Bernard sayth) that we might assure ourselves the divell was authour of that damnable sect? and who dare pronounce all the *Thomists*, *Scotists*, *Benedictines*, and the like, to be heretikes?"

Every person conversant with the writings of the Church of England divines, knows that they constantly apply the word *Catholic* to the common and ancient faith retained in their liturgy, and to those Christian men and Christian societies who have adhered to the

ancient faith; and that they have as constantly applied the word *Romanist* or *Papist* as a note of particularity to that schismatical and heretical faction, which, in the 16th century, split off from the Catholic Church of England, and set up separate congregations of their own. This is simply a fact; and whatever may or may not be inferred from it, we must take leave to adhere to the traditionary use received from our fathers.

CONVERSATION BETWEEN A ROMAN CATHOLIC NOBLEMAN AND A  
GENTLEMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

“ ‘ *Gent.*—\* \* \* \* \* It damns almost all the papists, as well as those that are not papists.’ ”\*

\* The author refers to the *Bulla in Coena Domini*, which is published at Rome every year on Maunday-Thursday, or the Thursday in the Passion Week, the day on which our Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist. Nowhere, perhaps, in the same compass can there be found a more faithful expression of the genius of the Roman as distinguished from the Catholic Church than is exhibited in this Bull; and nowhere certainly, except in the archives of Rome, does there exist such another specimen of impudence, arrogance, and (especially considering the time chosen for its publication) impiety and blasphemy. It is true, as Leslie says, that it damns almost all papists as well as those that are not papists; an incongruity which is of no moment compared to the advantage of keeping up a rule ready to be put in practice when the fitting time shall come.

The first section of this Bull damns not only all persons who live out of the Roman communion, and all their adherents, receivers, favorers and defenders, but also all who without the Pope's permission, “knowingly read, keep, print, or any ways, for any cause whatsoever, publicly or privately, on any pretext or color, defend, those books containing heresy or treating of religion.”

The second section damns all and singular of whatsoever station or degree, and puts an interdict on all universities and colleges, who appeal from the orders or decrees of the Pope, for the time being, to a future general council, together with all who aid and favor the appeal.

The seventh section damns all those who carry or transmit to the Turks, or to those who are expressly and by name declared heretics by the Roman See. horses, arms, iron, iron-wire, tin, steel, and all kind of metals and warlike instruments, timber, hemp, rope, &c., and other things of this nature which they may make use of to the prejudice of Christians and Catholics.

The eighth damns all persons, “even though they be bishops or kings,” hindering and invading those who bring provisions or other necessities for the Court of Rome.

The ninth damns all persons who apprehend or detain, by themselves or by others, those who come to or return from the Roman See.

The eleventh damns all those who apprehend, imprison or detain Roman cardinals, bishops, &c., or banish them from their territories.

“*Lord.*—We desire not to be called papists; we think it a word of contempt, as if we were only partisans for the Pope, and of that party or faction of Christians who would raise his power above the Church and every thing else.’

“*Gent.*—I am glad your lordship thinks so; and, indeed, the Church of France (where you were bred) are not papists in this sense; they are got free, in a good measure, from the servitude of the Pope, but they are still Roman Catholics.’

“*Lord.*—We do not delight in that word neither, as if our Catholicism were tied only to Rome; we term ourselves Catholics in general, as members of the Catholic, or Universal Church.’

The thirteenth damns, with all imaginable particularity, all persons, ecclesiastic or secular, who shall presume to appeal from any decrees pronounced by the Court of Rome or by its sanction; as also those who any other ways have recourse to secular courts and the lay power, and who cause such appeals to be admitted by the lay power, or who presume to restrain those who would carry their appeals to the See of Rome.

The fifteenth damns all persons who, under pretence of their office, shall summon before them to their tribunal, on any pretext whatever, ecclesiastical persons, against the rules of the canon law.

The eighteenth damns all those, even though they be emperors or kings, presidents of kingdoms, counselors, senators, &c., who, without the special and express license of the Pope of Rome, shall impose tributes, and other charges upon clergymen, prelates, and other ecclesiastical persons, and the goods and revenues of churches and monasteries.

The nineteenth damns “all and every magistrates and judges, notaries, scribes, executors, sub-executors, any ways intruding themselves in capital or criminal causes against ecclesiastical persons, by processing, banishing, or apprehending them, or pronouncing or executing any sentences against them, without the special, particular, and express license of this holy apostolical see.”

The Bull has in all thirty sections, but let these extracts suffice. They who can bring themselves to believe that this Bull is conceived in the spirit of the gospel of Christ, and adapted to make men loyal citizens and good Christians, will have no occasion to distinguish between Papists and Catholics. “True it is,” said the Parliament of Paris, A. D. 1687, speaking of this Bull, “that if this decree whereby the Popes declare themselves sovereign monarchs of the world, be legitimate, the majesty-royal will then depend on their humor, all our liberties will be abolished, the secular judges will no longer have the power to try the possession of benefices, nor the civil and criminal causes of ecclesiastical persons; and we shall quickly see ourselves brought under the yoke of the inquisition.”

It is a sad illustration (and there are many such) of the boasted unity of the Church of Rome, that while she constantly (once a year in due form) pronounces the above anathemas, she also constantly holds communion with many, *e. g.*, the French and English Romanists, who not only practically disregard them, but do not even receive the Bull which contains them; thus cutting off from her communion those who do not receive her sanctions, and at the same time holding communion with those she has cut off. A Church thus inconsistent with itself is not one; and its pretended unity is unreal—a sham.

“ ‘*Gent.*—We call ourselves so too, and in the same sense; and pray every day for the Catholic Church in our Liturgy. Therefore, we call not you Catholics, because it would not distinguish you from us; but Roman Catholics is calling a part the whole.’

“ ‘*Lord.*—You know the meaning; not that the particular Church of Rome is all the churches in the world, but she is called Catholic, as being the head principle of unity and communion to all other churches.’

“ ‘*Gent.*—If this be the frame of this Catholic Church, it must have been so always.’

“ ‘*Lord.*—Yes, surely, for there was always a Catholic Church: that is, some particular church so called, in the same sense as Rome is now.’

“ ‘*Gent.*—Pray then, my lord, tell me what particular Church was so called in this sense, before there was a Christian in Rome? And how came that Church to lose it? And how was it transferred to Rome? Every bishop, every church, and every member of it, may be called Catholic, and were so called, as being included in the general notion of the Catholic Church; but in the sense you have mentioned, as head and principle of unity to all churches, no bishop or Church ever had it, till taken up in the latter times by the bishop and Church of Rome.’”—*Leslie's "Case Stated,"* A. D. 1713.

The *unity* of the Divine Nature is the fundamental principle of the Catholic Church, and the exclusive assumption of the name *Unitarian*, by a particular denomination, is no proof of the contrary. Nobody in these days connects convulsive *tremblings* with the name of *Quaker*, or a certain *method* of devotion with that of *Methodists*. We call two-thirds of the people on the earth *Pagans*, without supposing them to be *peasants*; and *Heathen*, without doubting that the *nations* are ‘the Lord’s and his Christ’s.’ In like manner, we might cheerfully submit to dwarf down the word *Catholic* to the Creed of Pius IV. and the dimensions of the Roman Church, without a fear that the name would be taken for the thing, if custom, *quem penes*, etc., which gives the law to language, required it. But this is the very point at which I stick. Such a use of the word is, in my opinion, not only bad divinity, but bad English. It may be good Italian, or good French, or good Spanish, or good Irish, and from a convergence of such influences, it may be made (like many other solecisms) under the Noah Webster of the next generation, good American; but it certainly is not, and I hope never will be, good English; and though I would be no more wanting in courtesy than was Busby in loyalty, yet, as he refused to take off his hat to majesty in the presence of his scholars, so I confess there are many tokens of civility which I should prefer to the wilful perpetration of bad English.

At the risk of an abrupt transition, though with the certainty of a good suggestion to the reader, I shall quote (and so cut short this note) a passage from the able *Analysis of Irenæus*, by Dr. Beaven, the present learned professor of divinity in Trinity College, Toronto: "It is interesting that the self-same term which we now use to distinguish ourselves from separatists, was in use in his age, [the age of Irenæus, who lived in the second century,] namely, that of *Churchmen*. And that was perfectly natural, for the Church had a name from the beginning; but its attribute of *Catholicism* or universality, as distinguished from the confined locality of schisms and heresies, was not observed till afterwards, and therefore the name of *Catholic* was posterior to that of *Churchman*."—*Beaven's Irenæus*, p. 210.

---

P.—Page 31.

THIS point is so clearly and fully expressed by Archbishop Synge in his "Charitable Address to all those who are of the Communion of the Church of Rome," (London, A. D. 1746,) that, though the passage is long, I venture to quote it entire:

"When a Jew, a Turk, or a Pagan, or any person who has been brought up in infidelity, is converted to the true faith, before he is received and made a member of the Church of Christ, it has always and everywhere been the practice, that at the time of his baptism, he should solemnly make a profession of the Christian faith, and a promise of Christian obedience. The way of doing this has usually been, and still continues to be, by returning a proper answer to certain questions which, for that purpose, are appointed to be put to him: and when an infant is brought by his Christian parents or friends to be baptized, his sureties (whom we commonly call god-fathers and godmothers) do, in his name, make the like answers to the same questions, as a security to the Church, that the child shall be brought up in the same faith and religion. If, therefore, you would know what that faith and religion is, into which you have all been baptized, and thereby made members of Christ's Holy Church, and heirs of eternal salvation, I desire you would only read the office of baptism, as it is set down in the ritual of your own Church, and there you will find what answers you, or your sureties in your name, were required to make to the questions then proposed to you, which will fully inform you what that faith or religion is, which your own Church must allow to be sufficient in order to eternal salvation; because she requires no more from any man in order to his being received as a true member of the Christian Church, by

the holy sacrament of baptism. And because this matter is a little more fully expressed in the order of baptizing persons who are of age, than in that for the baptism of infants, I shall from thence faithfully translate all those same questions and answers, and then refer them to your serious consideration: nor will I conceal anything which is there added for the better understanding either the questions which are proposed, or the answers that are required to be returned to them.

“For example, then: Let us now suppose that a person from his infancy brought up in heathen idolatry, should be so far persuaded of the truth of Christianity, as to become a convert to it, and should apply to a priest of the Church of Rome, to the intent that he might be received into the Church by baptism: The Roman ritual, published by the Pope’s authority (which, in these cases, is allowed to be the rule whereby every such priest is to be directed)—the Roman ritual, I say, in the first place orders (and that very rightly) that such convert should be diligently instructed in the Christian faith, and the rules of holy living, and should, for some days, be exercised in works of piety; that his will and purpose should often be inquired into; and that he should not be baptized without sufficient instructions and knowledge, and by his own free will and consent. And that such his instruction, knowledge, will, and consent, may openly appear, so as to give satisfaction to the Church into which he is to be received, that he is a sincere convert, and a true Christian, the priest is required, before he baptizes him, to put the following questions to him, and the convert to return such answers as are subjoined to the several questions:

“*Priest.*—By what name art thou called?”

“*Convert.*—N.’

“*Priest.*—N. What desirest thou of the Christian Church?”

“*Convert.*—Faith.’

“*Priest.*—What does faith procure for you? [*Fides quid tibi præstat.*]

“*Convert.*—Eternal life.’

“*Priest.*—If thou wilt have eternal life, keep the commandments. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law depends, and the prophets. Now, faith is, that thou shouldst worship one God in Trinity, and the Trinity in unity, neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the substance of these three is one, and but one Divinity.’

“*Priest.*—N. Dost thou renounce Satan?”

“*Convert.*—I renounce him.’

“*Priest.*—And all his works?”

“*Convert.*—I renounce them.’

“*Priest.*—And all his pomps?”

“*Convert.*—I renounce them.’

“ ‘*Priest.*—Dost thou believe in God, the Father Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth?’

“ ‘*Convert.*—I believe.’

“ ‘*Priest.*—And dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh and eternal life?’

“ ‘*Convert.*—I believe.’

“In the order of administering baptism as well to infants as to persons who are of age, as it is set down in the Roman ritual, there are divers things which are liable to very just exceptions, of which I here take no notice, my only design at present being (as I have said), to show what that faith and religion is into which all members of the Roman communion are baptized. But as I pass along, I cannot but observe, that when the priest makes the sign of the cross upon the forehead and breast of such a convert as I am now speaking of, amongst other things which he says to him to exhort him to a holy life, he bids him abhor idols and reject images (*horresce idola, respue simulacra*), which, I think, is hardly to be reconciled with the practice of the Church of Rome, or with the faith which she professes and avows, it being expressly made an article of faith in that Church, that honor and veneration is due, and to be given, to the images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the other saints. Nor does it appear that the heathens themselves paid greater worship to their images, than what is maintained and practised in those countries where the Roman religion is established. Some, perhaps, will tell you, that simulacrum and imago have not exactly the same signification. For answer to which, I need only refer you to a Latin dictionary. Or, if there should be some small difference in the signification of these two words (as I profess I can find none), yet this would be but a poor distinction to rely upon in matters of faith and religion, upon which the salvation of our souls depends. But I must return to the point which I am now upon.

“That the Church may be the better satisfied that the convert is sincere in his profession of the Christian faith, he is required to repeat the Apostles’ Creed together with the priest, and also to say the Lord’s Prayer. Soon after which the priest puts the same questions to him, touching his renouncing of Satan, with all his works and pomps, and his belief of the Articles of the Christian Faith, and receives the same answers, as was done before; and then further asks:

“ ‘*Priest.*—N. What dost thou desire?’

“ ‘*Convert.*—Baptism.’

“ ‘*Priest.*—Wilt thou be baptized?’

“ ‘*Convert.*—I will.’

“And then the priest baptizes him with water, ‘In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:’ by which he is admitted as a member of the Church of Christ.”

I need not here stand to give you any fuller account of this order for administering baptism; of which you may fully satisfy yourselves

by having recourse to the Roman ritual, and such of you as do not understand the Latin tongue, may have it interpreted to you by any of your clergy. But what I have now faithfully extracted out of it, is sufficient to show, what that faith and religion is, upon the profession of which alone, every person is, by the sacrament of baptism, to be admitted a member of your own Church; and when an infant is brought to be baptized, his sureties, in his name, make the very same and no other profession.

Now here I beseech you to observe, that in all this there is not the least word or intimation of the Pope or his supremacy, the pre-eminence of the Church of Rome above all other churches, the doctrine of transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the worshipping of the host, the communion under one kind or species alone, doctrine of purgatory, with masses and prayers for the dead, indulgences, praying to saints, worshipping of images and relics; the number of seven sacraments, and neither more nor fewer, auricular confession to a priest, penance, pilgrimages; or of any point whatever, which at this time is controverted between you and us. If, then, neither the profession nor belief of any of these things is required as necessary to qualify any man to be baptized and received as a true member of Christ's Church, is it not most proper for you to examine and demand by what authority they are imposed upon you to be believed and received as necessary to eternal salvation? Can any thing be necessary to salvation, which God (the only Author and Giver of salvation) does not require from us? Or if God does thus require the belief and profession of these things from us, why are they not expressed, or at least sufficiently implied in that profession, which every Christian is required either in his own person, (or if he be an infant) by his sureties to make, when he is received as a member of Christ's Church by baptism?

The only answer to this difficulty that I could ever meet with from any of you, is, "That though those things are not here expressed, yet they are all sufficiently implied in that one article of the Catholic Church, which makes a part of the Apostle's Creed; it being the duty of every single Christian to believe as the Church believes, and that therefore when you profess that you believe the Holy Catholic Church, you therein profess the belief of all those things which the Church (you say) believes, and has accordingly defined; for which reason there are very few of you that ever give yourselves the trouble of making any farther inquiry into the particular points of your faith. But if this be a good answer, what necessity can there be for a Christian at the time of his baptism, or indeed at any other time, to make profession of any other article of faith besides this of the Holy Catholic Church, in which (according to this doctrine) all the rest are sufficiently implied and contained; or if it be necessary that a Christian, at the time of his baptism, or his sureties for him, should make profession of some other articles of faith beside this one; why not all of them? Or what reason can be given why the profession of faith, published by Pope Pius IV., in the year 1564, and now universally received and owned by the Church of Rome, as the true

Catholic faith, out of which no man can be saved, (as it is there expressed) why this profession of faith (I say) should not every Article of it, be made at the time of baptism? Indeed the matter seems very plainly to speak for itself, that great numbers of learned men of the Roman communion know very well, that the latter part of Pope Pius's profession of faith, which we reject, was no part of the faith of the ancient Christian Church; and, therefore, the governors of your church dare not make it a part of the baptismal profession, lest, by such an innovation, they should give occasion for a schism amongst yourselves, which every man may see, would soon be the consequence of the introduction of such a practice.

---

Q.—*Page 31.*

Several of our own theologians, *e. g.*, Bishops Beveridge and Bull and Dr. Waterland, have with great learning, traced the succession of doctrine in reference to the Holy Trinity, and to our Lord's divinity and consubstantiality with the FATHER, through the ante-Nicene fathers up to the age of the Holy Apostles. But I recollect no instance, and venture to say that none can be produced, of their excusing any ante-Nicene writer for denying the consubstantiality, on the ground that this doctrine had not then been defined by the Council of Nice. The reason is obvious; for if the doctrine of our Lord's divinity be true, its truth is evidently such as to be intrinsically necessary to salvation; as necessary before the Council of Nice as afterwards, and not first made necessary by the definition of the council. But when Bellarmine excuses some distinguished men (and among them, if I remember right, Cardinal Pole), for not believing the doctrine of justification, *e. g.*, as defined by the Council of Trent before the definitions were made, it is plain that he considers the necessity of the doctrine as flowing not from its intrinsic truth, but from the authority of the body defining and imposing it.

---

R.—*Page 33.*

The clause affirming the procession from the Son had been surreptitiously introduced into the creed in several of the Western churches before it received the sanction of the Roman See. Pope Leo III.,

when the matter was referred to him, resolutely refused to sanction the addition; and to show his care and reverence for the venerable symbol, he caused it to be engraved in silver plates, one in Latin, and another in Greek, in the same words in which the council of Constantinople had penned it, commemorating the procession from the Father only: "In the HOLY GHOST, the Lord, the Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, and is with the Father and the Son to be worshiped and glorified." These plates were taken out of the Archiva at Rome, says Bishop Pearson from Photius, and so placed by Leo that they might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true copies of that creed not to be altered. "Such," he adds, "was the great and prudent care of Leo the Third, that there should be no addition made to the ancient creed authorized by a general council, and received by the whole Church. But not long after the following Popes, more in love with their own authority than desirous of the peace and unity of the Church, neglected the tables of Leo, and admitted the addition," which affirms the procession from the Son. This was probably first done, as Pearson states, by Pope Nicholas I.

The common opinion of our great divines who have touched on this subject is, that this difference of expression involves no difference of opinion between the Eastern and Western churches. There can be no doubt, I apprehend, that the Greek Church, in retaining the precise words of the ancient symbol, has retained also the true faith which they were meant to express: for all confess that "The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father." Neither can there be a doubt that the Latin addition may be safely used; it being confessed by all that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, *i. e.*, from the person of the Father, and from the Son, *i. e.*, from the substance which is common to the Father and the Son, and numerically one in both. It may be questioned, however, whether the unauthorized addition of the Roman Church, which, unhappily, needs explanation, has not obscured the doctrine of the unity of the Divine nature, and given occasion to certain unhappy scholastic disputes, which, in modern times, have arisen in the West.\*

\* The curious and extraordinary work (printed, but not published, and dedicated to the Bishops and Synods of the Church in the United States) of the Rev. William Palmer, deacon, contains, p. 284 and 429, &c., a luminous comparison of the Greek and Roman doctrine on this subject. Whatever may be the result of Mr. Palmer's "appeal," the collateral benefits of it, in raising the tone of Catholic feeling, and inspiring a respect for the Eastern Church among Christians of the West, will, we may hope, be great and lasting.

The point which I wish to impress on the reader is the profound reverence which has ever been cherished for the CATHOLIC CREED, as declared by the ancient and œcumenical councils of Nice and Constantinople, of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and of the perils to which it, and through it, the unity of which it is the bond, has been exposed by the lust of power in the Roman See. With these remarks, I annex the Bull of Pius IV., to which reference is made in the text, in order that the reader may see the ground and origin of the Papal Creed. The translation, which follows it, is taken (together with the Latin) with a few verbal alterations from an anonymous writer of the 17th century.

BULLA SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI,

DOMINI PII,

DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPÆ QUARTI

SUPER FORMA JURAMENTI PROFESSIONIS FIDEI.

*PIUS, Episcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, ad perpetuam Rei Memoriam.*

Injunctim nobis Apostolicæ servitutis officium requirit, ut ea quæ Dominus omnipotens ad providam Ecclesiæ suæ directionem, Sanctis Patribus, in nomine suo congregatis, Divinitas inspirare dignatus est ad ejus laudem et gloriam incunctanter exequi properemus. Cum itaque juxta Concilii Tridentini dispositionem omnes, quos deinceps, Cathedralibus & superioribus Ecclesiis præfici, vel quibus de illarum dignitatibus, canonicatibus, & aliis quibuscunque beneficiis Ecclesiasticis, curam animarum habentibus, provideri continget, publicam orthodoxæ fidei professionem facere, seque in Romanæ Ecclesiæ obedientia permansuros spondere, & jurare teneantur: Nos volentes, etiam per quoscunque, quibus de Monasteriis, Conventibus, Domibus, & aliis quibuscunque locis Regularibus quorumcunque Ordinum, etiam Militarium quocunque nomine vel titulo providebitur, idem servari, & ad hoc, ut unius ejusdem fidei professio uniformiter ab omnibus exhibeatur, unicaque & certa illius forma cunctis innotescat, nostræ sollicitudinis partes in hoc alicui minime desiderari, formam ipsam præsentibus annotatam, publicari, & ubique gentium per eos ad quos ex decretis ipsius Concilii, & alios prædictos spectat, recipi & observari, ac sub pœnis per concilium ipsum in contravenientes latis, juxta hanc & non aliam formam, professionem prædictam solemniter fieri Auctoritate Apostolica, tenore præsentium districte præcipiendo mandamus hujus modi tenore.

Ego N. firma fide credo & profiteor omnia & singula, quæ continentur in Symbolo fidei, quo sancta Romana Ecclesia utitur: videlicet:—

Credo in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, factorem cœli & terræ, visibilium omnium & invisibilium, & in unum Dominum Jesum

Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, & ex Patre natum ante omnia sæcula, Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, genitum non factum, consubstantiali Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt: qui propter nos homines & propter nostram salutem descendit de cœlis, & incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, & homo factus est, crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus, & sepultus est & resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas, & ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dextram Patris, & iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos & mortuos, cujus regni non erit finis: & in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre, Filioque procedit: qui cum Patre & Filio simul adoratur & conglorificatur, qui locutus est per Prophetas: & unam Sanctam, Catholicam, & Apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum, & expecto resurrectionem mortuorum, & vitam venturi sæculi. Amen.

1. Apostolicas & Ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiæ observationes & constitutiones firmissime admitto & amplector.

2. Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum quem tenuit & tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu & interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto, nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam, & interpretabor.

3. Profiteor quoque septem esse vere & proprie Sacramenta, novæ legis a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis, licet non omnia singulis necessaria; scilicet, Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Uctionem, Ordinem & Matrimonium, illaque gratiam conferre, et ex his Baptismum, Confirmationem, & Ordinem, sine sacrilegio reiterari non posse.

4. Receptos quoque & approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritus, in supradictorum omnium Sacramentorum solemnī administratione recipio, et admitto.

5. Omnia & singula, quæ de peccato Originali, & de justificatione in Sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo definita & declarata fuerunt amplector et recipio.

6. Profiteor pariter in Missa offeri Deo verum, proprium & propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis & defunctis, atque in sanctissimo Eucharistiæ Sacramento esse, vere, realiter & substantialiter corpus & sanguinem, una cum anima & divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fierique conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, & totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, quam conversionem Catholica Ecclesia transubstantionem appellat.

7. Fateor etiam sub altera tantum specie, totum atque integrum Christum, verumque Sacramentum sumi.

8. Constanter teneo Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis adjuvari.

9. Similiter & sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, venerandos atque invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas.

10. Firmissime assero imagines Christi ac Dei paræ semper Virginis,

necnon aliorum sanctorum habendas & retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam.

11. Indulgentiarum etiam Potestatem a Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem esse, affirmo.

12. Sanctam Catholicam, & Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum matrem, & magistram agnosco, Romanoque Pontifici Beati Petri Apostolorum Principis successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario verum obedientiam spondeo ac juro.

13. Cætera item omnia a sacris canonibus, & oecumenicis conciliis, ac præcipue a sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita, & declarata, indubitanter recipio, atque profiteor, simulque contraria omnia atque hæreses quascunque ab Ecclesia damnatas, rejectas, & anathematizatas, ego pariter damno rejicio & anathematizo.

14. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in præsentī sponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam, usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum, constantissime (Deo juvante) retinere & confiteri, atque a meis subditis vel illis, quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri, & prædicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum.

Ego idem N. spondeo, voveo, ac juro sic me Deus adjuvet, & hæc sancta Dei Evangelia!

Volumus autem quod præsentēs literæ in Cancellaria nostra Apostolica, de more, legantur: & ut omnibus facilius pateant, in ejus Quinterno describantur, ac etiam imprimantur. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ voluntatis & mandati infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Siquis autem hoc attentare præsumpserit indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac Beatorum Petri & Pauli, Apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum, Anno Incarnationis  
Dominicæ Millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo quarto,  
Idibus Novembris, Pontificatus nostri Anno quinto.

FED. CARDINALIS CÆSIUS,  
Cæ. Glorierius.

Lectæ & publicatæ fuerunt suprascriptæ literæ Romæ in Cancellaria Apostolica Anno Incarnationis Dominicæ Millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo quarto. Die vero sabbati, Nona Mensis Decembris, Pontificatus sanctissimi in Christo Patris & Domini nostri Pii Papæ Quarti, Anno quinto.

A. LOMELINUS CUSTOS.

## THE BULL OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD,

THE LORD PIUS,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE THE IV. OF THAT NAME,  
UPON THE FORM OF THE OATH OF THE PROFESSION OF THE FAITH.

*PIUS, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, that these Presents  
may be of everlasting Memory.*

The office of apostolical service incumbent upon us, requireth, that such things as Almighty God, for the provident government of his Church, hath deigned by his divine Spirit to inspire into the Holy Fathers congregated in his name, we, without delay, hasten to execute to his praise and glory. Seeing, therefore, it is so disposed by the Council of Trent, that all such as hereafter shall be promoted to any præfectship in cathedral or other great churches, or to whom it shall happen to be provided for out of the dignities, canonries, and whatsoever other ecclesiastical benefices of the said churches, having a curateship, shall be obliged to make a public profession of orthodox faith, and to promise and swear, that they shall ever persevere in the obedience of the Church of Rome; we also having a will that the same be observed and practised by all such as shall be provided for out of monasteries, convents, houses, and whatsoever other places of regulars of whatsoever orders, even of military professions, under whatsoever name or title, and desiring also that so much solicitude as concerns ourself, may not to any one seem to be wanting in this matter, to the end that a profession of one and the same faith may be uniformly made by all, and one only and certain form thereof may be exhibited to all; we, by apostolical authority and by the tenour of these presents, districtly commanding, command, that the form which is expressed in these presents, be published, and throughout all nations, by those to whom it belongs, according to the decrees of the said council, and by others above said, be received and observed, and under such pains as the said council hath decreed against the refractory, the said profession shall be solemnly made in this following and no other form, and under this following tenour.

I, N., with firm faith, believe and profess all and several the things which are contained in the symbol of faith which the Church of Rome doth use, to wit:—

I believe in one GOD the FATHER ALMIGHTY, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible, and in one Lord JESUS CHRIST, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all time, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten and not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation descended from heaven and took flesh by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered, and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and is to come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead, of

whose kingdom shall be no end : and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, and is adored and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who spake by the prophets : and one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and expect the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

1. I most firmly receive and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other customs and constitutions of the same Church.

2. Also I admit the holy Scripture in that sense which the holy mother Church hath held and holdeth, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures ; nor will I ever receive or interpret them but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

3. I profess also that there are seven true and proper Sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, for the salvation of mankind, although all are not necessary to each one ; to wit, Order, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Matrimony ; and that these all give grace, and that of these Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

4. I also receive and admit all received and approved rites of the Catholic Church in the solemn administration of all the above said sacraments.

5. I also embrace and receive all and several the things which have been defined and declared in the sacred and holy synod of Trent concerning original sin and justification.

6. I also profess that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is contained truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood together with the soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and there is made a perfect change of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood ; which change the Catholick Church calleth transubstantiation.

7. I confess, also, that whole and entire Christ and the true Sacrament is received under one only species, (*of bread.*)

8. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that souls there detained are holpen by the suffrages of the faithful.

9. Likewise that the saints reigning with Christ, are to be worshipped and invoked, and that they offer prayers for us to God, and that their relics are to be worshipped.

10. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and of the other saints, are to be had and kept, and duty of honour and worship to be given to them.

11. I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left in the Church by Christ, and that the use of them is most conducive to the salvation of the Christian people.

12. The holy Catholick and Apostolick Church of Rome I acknowledge to be the mother and mistress of all churches ; and I vow, swear,

and promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, as successor of B. Peter, Prince of the Apostles and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

13. Also all and whatsoever other things delivered by way of tradition, defined and declared by the holy Canons, and the General Councils, and chiefly by the sacred and holy synod of Trent, I undoubtedly receive and profess: and at the same time all contrary things and heresies whatsoever, by the Church damned, rejected, and accursed, I also damn, reject, and accurse.

14. This true Catholick faith, without which no man can be saved; which at this present I freely profess and truly hold, I, the same N., do promise, vow, and swear most constantly, God assisting, to retain and confess entire and inviolate to the very last gasp of life; and to procure, as much as shall lie in me, that the same be held, taught, and preached by all my inferiours, and by those who are committed to my care and charge. *So God help me, and these holy Gospels of God!*

Moreover, it is our will that these present letters be read in our Apostolical Chancery according to the custom; and, that they may be more open to all, they shall be written in the Quintern of our said Chancery, and also imprinted.

Therefore it shall be lawful to no man whatsoever to infringe the page of this our will and commandment, or with daring rashness to contradict it. But if any one be so presumptuous as to attempt that, let him know that he shall incur the indignation of Almighty God, and of the B. Peter and Paul his apostles.

Given at Rome, at S. Peter's, Ann. Chr. 1564, the Ides of November, in the fifth year of our Pontificate.

FED. CARDINALIS CLESIVS.

Cae. Glorierius.

The letters above-written were read and published at Rome in the Apostolical Chancel, Ann. 1564, on Saturday the 9th of December, in the fifth year of the Pontificate of the Most Holy Father and Lord in Christ, our Lord Pope Pius the Fourth.

A. LOMELINUS CUSTOS.

In this Bull the Bishop of Rome, acting as the executive of the Holy Fathers, *i. e.*, the College of Cardinals, sets forth and commands to be received as of faith, certain things which the Spirit of God, (as it is professed) had inspired into them when congregated in His name.

The first point is, that every Christian "promise with firm faith to believe and profess all and several the things which are contained in the symbol of faith which the holy Church of Rome doth use."

The symbol or creed which follows, consists of two parts. The former part is the ancient and well known Catholic Creed; the other

part, which was never heard of until the publication of this Bull, is properly the Roman or Papal Creed.

It deserves to be remarked that, whereas, the Catholic creed comes to us directly from the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, and is their own act and profession, the Roman creed comes from the Council of Trent, at second hand, being compiled out of its voluminous proceedings by the Pope and his Cardinals.

The first article of the Roman creed is, "I most firmly receive and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other customs and traditions of the same Church ;" *i. e.*, the Church of Rome, which was mentioned expressly in the outset. The next article is, "I admit the holy Scripture in that sense which the holy mother Church both held and holdeth," &c. ; and if we wish to know what is meant by "holy mother Church," we must turn to the twelfth article, which declares the Church of Rome to be the mother and mistress of all churches, and exacts an oath of obedience to the Bishop of Rome.

Thus the compilers of this creed have contrived to work into it a covert confession that the Church of Rome is virtually the Catholic Church. I am not aware that the Council of Trent has inserted this point among its definitions of faith.

One feature of this Roman creed is remarkable ; and that is, the diminutive form of its expressions ; a form proper in the definitions of Trent for the determination of controversies, but a mere engine of craft when used, as in this creed, to conceal matters which plainly and honestly avowed might be promptly rejected. This is especially exemplified in the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th articles, which, though very soft in expression, are made to uphold the most stupendous abuses ; and are, in fact, mere bands to tie the corpse of Popery to the living body of Catholicism.

The same feeling which restrained me from making any comments, not required by my argument on the *temper* of the Bulls of Paul III. and Pius V., (see Appendix Mm and K,) restrains me also in the present instance. The three Bulls are equally, though in different ways, manifestations of the spirit of the Roman papacy ; but what manner of spirit it is which they manifest, is a point which may be safely left to the calm reflection of the reader.

It is difficult, however, to restrain an expression of sorrow and indignation when one sees the adulterate matter of this Papal creed, the mere sweepings of the schools, put on a level with the sublime and awful confession of the Catholic Church. That such a heap of opinions should be raised to the name of the

CATHOLIC FAITH, is indeed a natural consequence of the fundamental principle of the Roman Church, viz., that *it* is virtually the Catholic Church; but this very assumption, and the consequent imposition of these inferior matters, as terms of communion for all other churches, is itself a most palpable and flagrant violation of the golden maxim: "Unity in faith, liberty in opinion, and charity in all things." Whatever particular Church may separate from the Church of Rome, in consequence of the imposition of this new creed as a creed, and of the matters contained in it as necessary to salvation, the cause, and therefore the guilt of such separation and schism, belong, on Catholic principles, to the party that imposes it.

---

S.—Page 36.

I say, "power of government," or jurisdiction over all Christians and all Churches, and *appointed by* CHRIST; for as it was not from the Catholic Church, but only from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, that the Church of England originally withdrew, so a supremacy of power or authority conferred by Christ on the Bishop of Rome over the whole universal Church, is all that we have occasion to deny. What symbolical significance the fathers may attribute to the pre-eminence of St. Peter, (the prince of the apostles, as was Homer the prince of poets,) or what station the ancient Church may have accorded to the Bishop of Rome for the preservation of unity and order, are at this day questions of no practical moment; since the claim now set up under the specious name and pretence of "a centre of unity," is not for a primacy of order, or even for a governing power delegated by the Church, but for a supremacy of power and authority over the whole Church, conferred immediately by its Divine Head. It is folly and mockery (I hope it is never fraud and duplicity) for Romanists to multiply words about the *principium unitatis*, and the deference anciently accorded to the Pope of Rome by other popes,\* his equals by divine institution, when by the assertion of a universal supremacy for their Pope, founded on God's appointment, they have made a wreck of Catholic unity, and embroiled

\* The appellation of *Pope* (*Papa*) was, anciently, given to all Christian Bishops; but about the latter end of the 11th century, in the Pontificate of Gregory VII., it was usurped by the Bishop of Rome, whose peculiar title it has ever since continued.—See Appendix T. Note, pp. 143, 144.

in war and blood almost every nation in which they have lived. Only one explanation can be given of this readiness of Romanists to prove what we are not concerned to deny, and that is, their inability to prove the precise point which we do deny; for when they come to this, they handle it tenderly and evasively, and advance no argument which has not been answered again and again by their own men; and popes among the number. What better does Bellarmine than trifle on this point? He tells us in his fourth book, *De Romano Pont.* (chap. 23d,) in the words of St. Cyprian, that our Lord gave, *parem potestatem*, equal power and authority to all his apostles when he said to them, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." But if all were made equal in power, how could one have the rest in subjection? Nothing easier, if you will believe the cardinal; for thus he discourseth, (*Ibid.* lib. 1, c. 12,) "St. Cyprian says nothing against our opinion, for we confess that the apostles were equal in apostolic power, and had entirely the same authority over Christian peoples, but [we contend] that they were not equal among themselves;" thus distinguishing without making a difference, and granting all we ask; for if the apostles and their successors have altogether the same authority conferred on them by Christ over Christian people, how can it be said that Christ has ordained all Christian people to be subject only to one and his successor, (supposing for argument's sake the Bishop of Rome to be that successor,) exclusively of the rest? If the author had said that though all were equal in power yet one was superior in order to the rest, he would have spoken intelligibly, though not to the advantage of his cause.

It is a just and beautiful thought of St. Cyprian, in his treatise on the Unity of the Church, and in the very place but just referred to, that our Lord, in constituting His Church, though He conferred equal power on all His apostles, yet, to manifest His regard to *unity*, He took His rise from *one*, and settled the whole upon that foundation. "The other apostles," he says, "were, in truth, what Peter was, entitled to an equal share with him of dignity and power; but," he adds, "the process began with *one*, that the Church might be considered as *one*." How little reason the Protestant Church has to abstain from this pious reflection, because the Romanists have sought to turn it into an argument for their supremacy, will sufficiently appear from the calm note on the passage of Cyprian by his learned translator, Dr. Marshall, A. D., 1717:—

"It will be pretty difficult for the Church of Rome to confirm the pretensions of her bishop, by an argument rather designed for illustra-

tion than for strict reasoning; in which sort of discourse we know 'tis not unusual to take a liberty of alluding to diverse passages, from which no conclusive proof is ever intended. Our author's argument here is plainly of this sort; and he proceeds in it upon an allusion to Christ's choice of Peter to feed his sheep, and to found his Church in the singular number. But yet even upon this very argument he plainly enough declares, that in strictness of reckoning the other apostles were what Peter was. And in his 33d epistle he expressly asserts, that the Church is founded upon bishops in the plural; and indeed his whole management with Cornelius, and with Steven, bishops of Rome, shows he esteemed his episcopal chair in no degree inferior to theirs. Origen hath put a question, which, if he now were living, would greatly expose him to the danger of the inquisition; if you think (saith he) that the whole Church is founded singly upon the person of Peter, what will become of John, that son of thunder, and indeed of all the other apostles? He plainly makes there the confession of Peter, the rock upon which Christ would build his Church, and saith, that we may all have our parts in the honour of thus founding it, if we will make the same confession which Peter did. See him in tract 1, on St. Matthew, xvi., where he likewise observes, that other bishops claimed and exercised the same authority with Peter, and had a right to do so, if they would but endeavour to inherit his virtues, as well as his power. Irenaeus indeed hath given the true reason of all the precedency which the Roman see hath enjoyed, and he speaks for it in terms as high as most of the ante-Nicene fathers; ad hanc ecclesiam (viz. Romanam) propter potentio rem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam—in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio. (Haeres, lib. iii., cap. 3.) Now it is no wonder that a Church, which was fixed in the imperial seat, and which happened to preserve at that time an uncorrupted purity of doctrine, should have a regard paid to it superior to any other single Church. It had indeed better means and helps for preserving the purity of its doctrine, from the circumstance of its being so near the imperial seat; where the greatest numbers of good and able men might naturally be expected; and from whence the records of what had been delivered by the apostles might more faithfully and fully be transmitted, than they could be from any other Church. We could wish it were so now; and then we should be less apt to dispute with her bishop any precedences which he could reasonably claim."—*Marshall's Cyprian*, Part i., p. 97.

P.S. I have said nothing of the claim to the obedience of the British churches, sometimes set up for the Bishop of Rome on the ground of his being "the Patriarch of the Western Church," because the question of a patriarchate founded on *human* right is entirely foreign to the real question at issue ; which respects a *supremacy*, as *universal* bishop, founded on *divine* right. It may, however, be well enough to remark, that "Patriarch of the Western Church," though a very sonorous title, has nothing more to recommend it than its sound ; the Patriarchate of the Bishop of Rome, while it lasted, having comprised only a part of Italy and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica. In fact, there is not a shadow of proof that any such patriarchal power was recognized in the British churches during the first six centuries, but clear proof to the contrary. What the ancient Church would have thought of the claim of the Roman Patriarch to jurisdiction in Britain, if it had ever been made, may be seen from the eighth canon of the Council of Ephesus, quoted pp. 53, 54, of this Appendix. About the year 600, the Saxons were converted under the great and good Pope Gregory. A very few years afterwards the Pope of Rome began to usurp, under the grant of an usurping emperor, the title of Universal Bishop, which is totally inconsistent with that of patriarch ; so that in truth "the Patriarchate of the Western Church" is a figment. Whoever wishes to examine the subject may consult the brief treatise of the learned Cave, on the Ancient Church Government,\* and particularly the fifth chapter, on the bounds of the Roman Patriarchate ; and Bramhall's Just Vindication, chapter ninth. Bishop Bilson, who wrote in the 16th century, has summed up the merits of the case in a few words : "As for his [the Bishop of Rome's] Patriarchate, by God's law he *hath* none ; in this realm for six hundred years after Christ he *had* none ; for the last six hundred years, looking after greater matters, he *would* have none ; above, or against, the prince's sword he *can* have none ; to the subversion of the faith or oppression of his brethren, he *ought* to have none : you must seek further for subjection to his tribunal ; this land oweth him none."

\* In Carey's edition of Cave's Works, the Dissertation on Church Government is appended to the "Primitive Christianity."

T.—Page 39.

There is scarcely a nation in Europe which has not been embroiled in contests with the See of Rome in consequence of its intolerable oppression and extortion; and the history of every contest has proved the wisdom of the Church of England in utterly renouncing the supremacy which other churches have vainly endeavoured to limit. The Gallican Church is a remarkable instance. It once enjoyed rights and liberties similar to those which the Church of England, in the sixteenth century, claimed as her ancient inheritance, and has at times courageously asserted those rights and liberties in opposition to the Court of Rome. Witness the declaration of the Gallican clergy, A. D. 1682, and the proceedings of the Parliament of Paris in 1687; in which they say, among other things to the same effect: “The king is most religious in nominating to the prelacies ecclesiastics of an exemplary integrity, and of conspicuous merit; and because that these ecclesiastics do not believe that the Pope is infallible; that they do not, like the Italian doctors, attribute to him the title of *universal monarch*; that they are persuaded he has no power either direct or indirect over the temporality of kings; and that he is to all intents inferior to the councils, that have a right to correct him and reform his decisions; the Pope, upon this imaginary pretence, refuses these Bulls, and *leaves the third part of the churches of the kingdom destitute of pastors*. Is this imitating the care and lenity of the apostles in the government of the Church?” They add, however, notwithstanding their complaints and grievances: “We shall ever remain inseparably united to the Holy See; we will acknowledge St. Peter’s successor as the first and chief of the bishops; we will most religiously maintain the communion and correspondence with the Church of Rome, and will defend ourselves with as much moderation as vigor against the insults, invasions and innovations contrary to the king’s rights, to the dignity of his crown, to the decrees of the councils, to the general policy of our Church, and to our liberties.”

It was soon after this struggle, in which Rome gained the victory, that Leslie, an English divine, addressed the following words to Bossuet:

“I am inclinable to believe, that if your lordship in particular, and other bishops in the Gallican Church, were at liberty, each in his own district, to regulate such matters as you might do with a good

conscience, things might be brought to bear so, from such a happy beginning of reformation, as that though men might differ in some particular opinions, as they always will, yet that terms of communion might be adjusted between us, upon Catholic principles, to the honour of God, and peace of His Church. And if such a communion were begun, though but with a few bishops, who would exert their just power, it might bring the Church to that state, in time, in which all good men wish to see her. And if a Catholic communion were restored, we should see again the primitive face of the Church. But no step can be made towards this while the Pope's supremacy ties up the power of all other bishops in their own respective churches; and we hardly expect that he will give way to any thing that will in the least infringe the plenitude of his supremacy. You have made an experiment of it in your general assembly of 1682. And if he will not suffer his supremacy to be limited and reduced to the standard of the ancient canons, we can see no remedy, my lord, but that it must be taken away. Why should we have any hesitation to take that out of the way, which is the visible *remora* to the uniting of all Christian churches, and the restoring of Catholic communion all the world over? to take that out of the way, which your bishops of France, as well as those of the Greek Church, and ours in England, are fully convinced is an usurpation? against which you have often struggled, and still do complain; but we have thrown it off, seeing no other way possible to get from under its usurpation."

But the supremacy was not renounced in France; and the Court of Rome, watching its opportunities, has contrived, in every change of public affairs, to extort further concessions, and to forge new links in the chain that binds the French Church to a foreign ruler. The following, from the London Times (which I find in the New-York Times of April 27th), will show how the case stands under Napoleon III.

"The Court of Rome seems to have demanded as the price of undertaking the consecration of such a sovereign as Louis Napoleon, several important concessions, such as the surrender of certain of the organic articles touching the Church, which were annexed to the Concordat of 1801 by Napoleon I., though never recognized by the Vatican, and, more especially, a change in the present provisions of the French law of marriage, which renders it necessary that the legal contract should be completed before the solemnization of the religious ceremony. The High Catholic party demand, on the contrary, that the sacrament (as they consider marriage to be) should precede the civil contract. These questions have added fuel to the flame already kindled by the pretensions of the Ultramontane writers and prelates of France, and by the evident design of the whole Romish clergy to assert a degree of power in the State which it never obtained, even in the latter years of Charles X. For instance, the other day a young man was put upon his trial at Rouen, convicted, and sentenced to

fourteen days' imprisonment, for the offence of receiving the holy communion before he had been confirmed by the bishop. It is a revival of the spirit that dictated the Law of Sacrilege, and the most unpopular and intolerant measures of the Restoration. The Romish clergy are endeavouring to arm their spiritual authority with the terrors of civil justice, and to place the State, in all its public functions, in closer dependency on the Church. These pretensions of a part of the clergy, who are at once arrogant towards their own civil rulers and servile to a foreign power, are supported by Cardinal Gousset, Archbishop of Rheims, who endeavoured, ten years ago, to bring all the liturgies of France to the standard of the Romish breviary, the Bishop of Moulins, the Archbishop of Avignon, and many others. For it is to be feared that the majority of the French clergy are more disposed than they have ever been before to sacrifice those principles of their national Church which were asserted by Bossuet in the celebrated articles of 1682, and maintained without compromise in all the more glorious epochs of French history. The Bishops of Montpellier, of Evreux, and, perhaps, of Orleans, are considered at this time the only true Gallican prelates of the French Church, though the Archbishops of Besançon and Paris incline in the same direction. But the sound principles of French ecclesiastical independence find their ablest representatives in the magistrature, and M. Dupin has lately resumed his pen to defend those traditions which he has already asserted under so many different forms of government. Louis Napoleon has hitherto seemed to favour the Ultramontane doctrines, but this policy was dictated chiefly by his desire to get the Pope to Paris; and as that hope fades away, the *Moniteur* has been instructed to contradict the intention attributed to the government for a change in the law of civil marriage, in terms which will be bitterly resented by the High Church party."

Philip IV. of Spain, A. D. 1633, called a general assembly of all the estates of the kingdom of Castile to consider and take means to remedy the grievances to which that people were subjected by their connection with the See of Rome. The assembly met and drew up a memorial, consisting of ten articles, in which they allege the same abuses, innovations and extortions that had been inflicted on the people of England. Among other scandalous abuses, they complain of the extortions of the Roman Court in the case of dispensations; that a great price supplied the want of a good cause; and that for a matrimonial dispensation under the second degree, they took of great persons 8,000, or 12,000, or 14,000 ducats. They complain that the Pope took upon him to dispose of all the rights of all ecclesiastical persons, and that he preferred not their bishops to enjoy their own patronage and jurisdiction; and they tell the Pope (Urban VIII.) in the words of Bernard, that the Roman Church was the mother of

other churches, but not their lady or mistress ; and that he himself was not the lord or master of other bishops, but one of them.

“ They complained that the Pope did challenge and usurp to himself, as his own, at their deaths, all clergymen’s estates, that were gained or vested out of the revenue of the Church ; that a rich clergyman could no sooner fall sick, but the Pope’s collectors were gaping about him for his goods, and guards set presently about his house ; that by this means bishops have been deserted on their death-beds, and famished for want of meat to eat ; that they had not had, before they were dead, a cup left to drink in, nor so much as a candlestick of all their goods (it is their own expression) ; that by this means creditors were defrauded, processes in law were multiplied, and great estates wasted to nothing.

“ They complained that the Popes did usurp as their own all the revenues of bishoprics during their vacancies, sometimes for divers years together, all which time the churches were unrepaired, the poor unrelieved, not so much as one alms given, and the wealth of Spain exported into a foreign land, which was richer than itself. They wish the Pope to take it as an argument of their respect to the See of Rome, that they do not go about forthwith to reform these abuses by their own authority, in imitation of other provinces.”

Instead, however, of taking this decisive step, Spain accepted some concessions, and remained under what they called “ a most grievous yoke ;” and what advantage has Spain since reaped by its submission ? England did that which Spain only asserted its right to do, renounced the papal jurisdiction, and reformed abuses by its own authority ; and “ by means of this alteration of religion,” says Camden, (Eliz. p. 31,) “ England (as the politicians have observed) became of all the kingdoms of Christendom the most free, the sceptre, as it were, manumitted from the foreign servitude of the Bishop of Rome ; and more wealthy than in former ages, an infinite mass of money being stayed at home which was wont to be exported daily to Rome (the commonwealth being incredibly exhausted thereby) for first-fruits, pardons, appeals, dispensations, palls, and other such like.”

Sicily was another instance of an open rupture with the See of Rome for grievances of the same sort. “ Upon pretence of apostolical authority,” says Baronius, the Roman historian, “ a grievous offence is committed against the Apostolic See . . . the power whereof is weakened in the kingdom of Sicily, the authority thereof abrogated, the jurisdiction wronged, the ecclesiastical laws violated, and the rights of the Church dissipated.” But cardinal though he were,

the king (Philip III. of Spain) for this and like passages, ordered his books to be publicly burned.

Portugal, too, has had the same struggle. The "*Lusitaniæ Gemitus*," or "Groans of Portugal," tells us that the Portuguese claimed, as among their ancient customs and essential rights of the crown, (and the rights of a crown in a monarchy are the rights of the people in a republic,) the nomination of their own bishops, without which condition they tell the Pope plainly (this was in the 17th century) that they neither can nor ought to receive them. And after a full statement of grievances, and of the affronts and repulses they had met in seeking redress at Rome, they remind the Pope that Portugal, and all the provinces that belong to it in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, "is more than one single sheep," and that "St. Peter's ship, which hath been often in danger in a calm sea, ought not to be opposed to the violent course of just complainers."

We find the States of Portugal also, during these contests, submitting several questions, touching the relation of the Church of Portugal with the Pope of Rome, to the University of Lisbon; and among them the following: whether in case there were no recourse to the Pope, the king of Portugal might permit the consecration of bishops without the Pope in his kingdom? to which the university answered in the affirmative, giving this reason for its decision, that "episcopacy was of divine right, but the reservation of the Pope's approbation was of human right, which doth not bind in extreme nor in very great necessity."

But the country of Europe which followed most nearly in the steps of England was Venice, in the 17th century. That republic had made several laws; as first, that no ecclesiastical person should lay claim to a certain description of lands possessed by the laity; that no person within their dominion should found any Church, monastery, hospital, or other religious house, without the special license of the State, upon pain of imprisonment and banishment, and confiscation of the soil and buildings; that none of their subjects should alienate any lands to the Church or in favor of any ecclesiastical persons, without the special license of the Senate; they had, moreover, imprisoned certain ecclesiastical persons for crimes of which they had been convicted. The Pope (Paul V.) commanded the Venetians to abrogate these laws and set their prisoners at liberty; threatening them if they disobeyed with an interdict and excommunication, and the forfeiture of goods held of the Church, and enjoined the ecclesiastics to publish his Bull and suspend divine offices.

But the Venetians stood their ground; they protested publicly against the Pope's Bull; commanded the clergy to celebrate divine offices daily in spite of the Pope's interdict; banished from their city the few who disobeyed; and caused works to be written and published against the jurisdiction of the Roman Court; some of which were condemned by the Inquisition, and forbidden to be read under pain of excommunication.\* And though at length, through the mediation of other parties, the dispute was settled, yet the Venetians refused to abrogate their laws; nay, "they refused (though the Pope did press it most instantly, and the Cardinal Joyeuse did assure them that it would be more acceptable to his holiness than the conquest of a kingdom) to readmit the banished persons into their city. They refused to take an absolution from Rome; yea, they were so far from it, that, when the ambassador intreated that the duke might receive a benediction from him publicly in the Church, both the Duke and Senate did resolutely oppose it, because it had some appearance of an absolution."†

As long as the supremacy of the Pope is acknowledged, and the churches of various countries, instead of managing their own affairs at home, look to a foreign jurisdiction for the appointment of their officers, and the ultimate hearing of appeals and determination of causes, it is to be expected that collisions of this sort will occur; and as almost every Catholic Church in Europe has felt the evil, and come at one time or another very near to the remedy, so we may reasonably expect that some of them will yet acknowledge and apply that remedy; assert their perfect right and ultimate authority to redress grievances and reform abuses; and follow the example of the Catholic Church of England, in the imperishable declaration that the Bishop of Rome should be reduced within his just limits, and have no jurisdiction beyond what the canons of the Universal Church have assigned him.

It is evident from these movements that there is nothing in the constitution of the Catholic Church to restrain the bishops of any

\* Very remarkable are the words of Bellarmine, one of the most moderate of the papal party in this dispute: "That to restrain obedience due to the Pope unto matters appertaining only to the soul was to reduce it to nothing; that St. Paul appealed unto Cæsar, who was not his judge, and not to St. Peter, was because he would not make himself in those days ridiculous. That the ancient Popes professed subjection to the Emperors, was to comply with the humour and affection of those times." See Rycaut's continuation of Platina, life of Paul V. who gives a synopsis of the arguments on both sides.

† See Bramhall's *Just Vindication*, Part I. c. 7.

country, acting in concert with their clergy and laity, from asserting the true rights and liberties of the Church, and effecting the reformation of those notorious abuses which it has long been the interest and policy of the Roman See to perpetuate. A general movement of this nature, without disturbing the existing relations of archbishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs, but regarding them as *human* appointments for the preservation of order, and as responsible to the Church in its *divinely* constituted character of the perpetual witness and guardian of heavenly truth, and the dispenser of the faith and sacraments of Christ, would carry us back to the ancient basis of co-ordinate communion; the true and safe channel, marked out on the chart of divine inspiration, between the Scylla and Charybdis of Papal tyranny and infidel anarchy.

Of the necessity of such a reformation on the part of the numerous Catholic Churches in communion with the See of Rome, and of the immense benefits that would result from it, no question can be made, except by those whose reason is warped by interest, or buried in the clouds of prejudice and passion. That reasonable men may be firmly convinced that the evils of the present Roman system are less than those which would be consequent on a change, or an attempt at reformation, is probable enough; but, apart from this consideration, who can deny that it is simply better to have the divine offices of the Church celebrated (agreeably to the ninth canon of the fourth council of Lateran\*) in a living than a dead language? to expunge myths and fables from the holy services of the Church than to retain them? to direct the religious worship of Christ's faithful people exclusively to the blessed and adorable Trinity, than to expose them to manifest peril of idolatry, and to accustom them to usages of which, it may be safely said, without attempting to settle the formal notion of idolatry, that they cannot be distinguished from the idolatrous rites of ancient Greece and Rome? to inculcate simply, and without qualification, honor and obedience to the civil authority, and to spiritual pastors chosen and appointed in the country of one's birth, and responsible only to the Church and government of that country, than

\* The fourth council of Lateran was held A. D. 1215, and the canon referred to, and which requires the Divine Offices to be administered in a language understood by the people, reads as follows:

"Because in most parts there are within the same state or diocese people of different languages mixed together, having under one faith various rites and customs; we distinctly charge that the bishops of these states or dioceses provide proper persons to celebrate the divine offices, and administer the sacraments of the Church, according to the differences of rites and languages, instructing them both by word and example."

to entwine the thoughts and affections of men around the government and institutions of a foreign land?

That these and many like abuses will eventually awaken a sober and resolute spirit of reform in the heart of some or all of the Catholic churches now in communion with the See of Rome, can hardly be doubted.

Of the temper of the Catholic churches in Europe, at the present day, and of their suppressed hatred of the subtle and intensely selfish policy of the Roman Court, a remarkable proof has been lately furnished in the work of Dr. Hirscher, Dean of the Metropolitan Church in Freiburg, Breisgau, and Professor of Theology in the Roman Catholic University of that city; a work which distinctly advocates reforms similar to those made in England in the sixteenth century, and which has gone rapidly through three editions in Germany, and been translated into French, with strong commendations, by a Belgian layman. This interesting and significant treatise has been translated into English by the Rev. A. Cleveland Coxe, of Hartford, who has prefixed to it an introduction of his own, from which I make the following extract:

"But while the Gallican Church, as no longer Gallican, but existing, as Hirscher testifies, outside the nation,\* in its ecclesiastics only, has undoubtedly become thoroughly ultramontane, it cannot be doubted that a widely diffused leaven of *Hirscherism*, if I may be pardoned the word, is at work throughout Europe. What Robertson chooses to call *Febronianism*,† as if it were the mere remainder of the last century's work, and of the Synod of Ems, is still, by his own confession, alive in Austria. Indeed, if report says true, the bishops of Austria have been on the eve of dissolving with the Pope, and establishing their own patriarchal independence, during the present pontificate.‡ But this movement is not Febronianism, it is not Hirscherism, it is a general, an earnest, and a holy action of the better class of minds throughout the Roman churches, resulting from the revived study of the primitive fathers, the decay of the papal power, and the monstrous attempt to make an article of faith of the blasphemous fable of the immaculate conception!§ Like all movements in the

\* See also *De L'Etat et des besoins Religieux et Moraux des populations et France*: par M. L'Abbé J. Bonnetat. Paris, 1845. For an extract, see Blackwood, May, 1849.

† In his introduction to Moehler's Symbolism.

‡ See Blackwood, June, 1848.

§ Hirscher, in his *Antwort*, while he quotes St. Bernard's famous letter on this subject, with evident willingness to attack the figment, only cites it *professedly*, to justify his own bold remonstrances. A translation of this letter was contributed by the writer to the (American) Church Review, July, 1849. A quotation from Demoulin, on the same subject, will be found in the present work.

Church, of which the Holy Spirit is the author, it appears to be unconcerted and universal. The Church of England is only sharing with all Christendom its mighty action and its feeble reaction. The latter is numbering its victims here and there, but the former is sublimely and steadily making head towards the thorough resuscitation of the Church, and to the propagation of the faith throughout the British Empire.

"The movement of Nuytz, in Piedmont, has attracted some attention, as being Italian; but it cannot be doubted, that if all Italy were as free as Sardinia, similar developments would be seen everywhere. No reference is intended here to the politico-religious and democratic spirit of the new Italian tribunes, although the popular sympathy with them, and the universal hatred of the Church and its clergy,\* is a dreadful proof of Hirscher's general statements. There is a better and a deeper spirit, like that of our author, working in the hearts and minds of many. Amongst many similar publications, the writer found at Turin a work addressed 'To the conscience of Pius the Ninth,'† by a devout Romanist, in which the pontiff is besought to imitate the first bishops of Rome; to divest himself of sovereignty, and to become a bishop indeed; and in which the matter of lay-rights and diocesan-synods is discussed as by our author, and with the citation of the same primitive authorities.‡ In the same spirit writes Bordas Demoulin, in France;§ and the late *mandement* of the

\* In Turin and Genoa, the Pope and the clergy are the subjects of innumerable caricatures and pasquinades, which are openly displayed in the public streets. *Addio al Papa* is the title of a red-hot Protestant publication, which looks strangely on large placards, about the Capital of Sardinia, staring a population of professed papists in the face.

† The temporal power of the Pope is most eloquently attacked in this work, and the primitive idea of a bishop forcibly presented in contrast. Take the following noble passage: "Ma il fatto sta che non hanno luogo prescrizioni; e la chiesa co' gemiti de' suoi santi, l'uminità con gli scritti de' suoi difensori, i popoli con isgomentevoli clamorio con silenzio pui isgomentevole ancora, con querele e preghiere, con lacrime e con sangue hanno le mille volte protestato. Protestare! Questa voce ricorda la terribile testimonianza di Bossuet, confessante che l'odio del potere temporale fu quello che in Alamagna spianò le vie alla Riforma, e che per conseguenza dall'una e dall'altra parte rese più gravi le sciagure." As to the special plea, that the temporal power is requisite to the independence of the pontiff, he answers, in a strain of irony not usual with him: "So, then, Gregory XVI. was more independent than St. Paul, and Pius I. led to martyrdom a poor slave, compared with Clement VII. waiting upon Charles V! If so, the Popes must reign by the grace of — Paixhan guns, and the symbol of the Dove should give place to a bombshell." In this last there is more truth than poetry, as one may see, at Rome; where there are many recent ruins, as well as ancient ones, by virtue of which Pius IX. still sits in the chair of St. Clement. No wonder, then, that, as this writer further testifies, "il nome di chierico è abovito e vituperato negli stati papali."

‡ *Roma e il Mondo*, di N. Tommaseo. Turin, 1851. A work which is, in some respects, as interesting as Hirscher's.

§ *Lettre à M. L'Archêvêque de Paris, sur son mandement contre les droits des laïques et des prêtres dans D'Eglise*, par Bordas Demoulin. This writer is also author of many other works.

Archbishop of Paris has called out other writers in a similar vein ;\* showing that St. Bernard and St. Louis† have yet their representatives in that unhappy country, to which poor Bossuet ventured to call attention, as so fortunate in saving herself from revolutions by rejecting reformation ! The immediate translation of Hirscher into French,‡ with comments of his own, by Adolphe Stappaerts, a layman of Antwerp, must also be mentioned ; and, as further indicative of a general movement, the writer may mention, that under the *Damnatio*, affixed to the gates of the Quirinal and Vatican, he saw last autumn, in addition to the works of Nuytz,§ and others of a similar character,|| the title of a Spanish treatise,¶ apparently reviving the position taken by the Spanish doctors at the Council of Trent.

"Hirscher must be regarded, therefore, as the foremost in a general and spontaneous movement throughout the Roman communion, which the Pope will hardly be able to overcome in his present decayed and impotent position."\*\*

To these intelligent observations of Mr. Coxe, I will add the following definite statement of Dr. Hirscher, of the reforms which are, as he tells us, extensively desired in Germany, which are now openly contended for in Belgium, and an under current in favor of which probably exists in every Church in communion with the Church of Rome :

"A third point to which the Church must direct its immediate attention is, the satisfaction of that general desire which is prevalent for certain reforms. This desire is of long standing, and very familiar to us.†† What is wanted is, for example, an improvement in the

\* Lettre à Monseigneur L'Archêvêque de Paris. Par x.x. In some respects, this anonymous writer, though he writes in a different tone, is superior to Demoulin.

† Depuis le douzième siècle, L'Europe travaille à-s' émanciper de la domination sacerdotale et papale . . . . et les premiers grands promoteurs de l'entreprise ont été St. Bernard et St. Louis.—*Demoulin*.

‡ L'état Actuel de L'Eglise, par S. B. Hirscher, traduit de l' Allemand, sur la III<sup>me</sup>. édition, par Adolphe Stappaerts. Anvers, 1851. To this work the present writer is primarily indebted for all he knows of Hirscher, and for much assistance in making an English translation from the German.

§ Juris Ecclesiastici Institutiones, Joannis Nepomuceui Nuytz, in Regio Taurinensi Athenæo professoris. etc.

|| Manuale Compendium Juris Canonici, ad usum Seminariorum, justa temporum circumstantias accommodatum. Auctore J. F. M. Lequeux.

¶ Defensa de la autoridad de los Gobiernos y de los Obispos contra les pretensiones de la Curia Romana, por Francisco de Paula, etc.

\*\* So a French Romanist speaks of the peaceful regeneration of the Church as a thing—"qui à été tenté, il est vrai, si souvent et si vainement, mais dans des temps différents des nôtres !" Lettre de xx.

†† "So the letter to the Archbishop of Paris, 'J'exprime un vœu, que je crois être conforme au vœu général . . . et je pense encore qu'une sage réforme, qui cette fois, au lieu de nous diviser, pourrait, au contraire, nous réunir, serait préférable à une révolution.'"

worship of the Church; a revision of its liturgical formularies; the translation of the liturgy into the vulgar tongue; communion in both kinds; the reform of the confessional; the simplification of ceremonies; and such like changes. So, too, we need an amelioration of ecclesiastical discipline; the abolition of the forced celibacy of priests; and the revision of certain ecclesiastical observations. We need further improvements, for example, in the Table of Lessons, and a greater variety in the selections from the Gospels and Epistles. We need emancipation from that tyranny which imposes upon the faithful, as Catholic doctrine, matters which have never been settled by the Church. Finally, we require reforms in the constitution of the Church; the revival of Synodal institutions; and the proportionate participation of clergy and laity in the affairs of the Church."—*Pp.* 181, 182.

The time for such a movement is in God's hand; we have only to remain quietly in the station in which His providence has placed us, and pray and labor for the coming of His kingdom. To human observation the chief lets and hindrances to the desired Reformation appear to be these:

I. The insignificance and practical nullity of the Episcopate in the Roman communion.

Our Lord JESUS CHRIST foresaw, and did all that was needful on His part to avert the evils which have happened to His Church. He appointed an order of men to succeed the apostles in the government of His Church. To these He committed the care and oversight of His flock. These He made the *immediate* depositaries of His authority, that they might be *directly* accountable to Him for its exercise. The supervision or episcopate, thus divinely instituted, was, in the memorable words of St. Cyprian, single; was one, of which each bishop held his part, with the privilege and duty of being interested in the whole. The partners in this episcopacy were the Popes or Fathers of the Church, and the Vicars of Christ.\* In the churches of the Roman communion, this divine provision of JESUS CHRIST, for

\* The title *vicarius Christi* (vicar of Christ) was in the early Church given to all bishops. The author of the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, contained in the works of St. Ambrose, says, at v. 10, ch. xi., 1 Cor.: "*Episcopus habet personam Christi. Quasi ergo ante judicem, sic ante episcopum, quia vicarius Domini est.*"

So St. Cyprian, in his 59th Epistle (Fell's edition) to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome: "*Neque enim aliunde haereses abortae sunt, aut nata sunt schismata quam inde quod sacerdos Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos, et ad tempus iudex vice Christi cogitatur,*" (p. 261.) Again to Horentius, (Ep. 66, p. 285): "*Christi, qui dicit ad Apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes praepositos,*

the protection and comfort of His Church, has been for several hundred years subverted. The bishops of that Church are bishops only in name. The deep and awful consciousness of a power of supervision entrusted to them *immediately* by CHRIST, and for which they are *directly* responsible to him, they have not, and in their present position cannot have. On their present system, the followers of Christ how numerous soever and how widely soever dispersed, have but one true bishop, one Pope, one vicar of Christ. Both the titles and the authority which they express, which were once diffused among all bishops, are now concentrated in one. That one has all episcopal jurisdiction at his disposal. From him, and not from Christ by means of their consecration, must other bishops receive such degrees and measures of jurisdiction as he may see fit to bestow. He may parcel it out as he pleases; give it to deacons and presbyters, and, under the name of Cardinals, set them over all the bishops upon earth; and limit it or revoke it from bishops at his will. Thus the institution of Christ, for the propagation of His gospel and the purity of His Church, is abolished. He provided that there should be in every country an order of men to represent His person, and to govern the Church on their responsibility to Him; whereas the Roman system, in the very teeth of Christ's ordinance, provides that there shall be no such persons in any country on earth, but that they, in every country, who ought to fill this office, shall take their authority from the Bishop of Rome, and account to him for its exercise. Instead of being the direct representatives of Christ, the bishops of churches in communion

qui Apostolis *vicaria ordinatione* succedunt, qui audit vos, me audit, et qui me audit, audit eum qui me misit.

Anciently the title *Papa* (Pope) was given to every Bishop. The Presbyters and deacons thus address their letter to St. Cyprian, (Ep. 30,) Cypriano *Papæ*, and at the close they style him, "beatissime et gloriosissime Papa." In the eighth epistle written to the clergy of Carthage during his absence, they speak of him as the blessed Pope Cyprian—"benedictum Papam." St. Jerome frequently gives the same title to St. Augustin, (Ep. 39, 68, 72, &c., Migne's ed. of St. Aug. Works,) and also to Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, (St. Jerome's Works, Ep. 99 ed. Migne.) St. Augustin addresses Aurelius, a brother bishop, in the same style, (Opera Ep. 41 and 60.) Rigaltius, (a Romanist,) in a note on the eighth epistle in St. Cyprian's works above mentioned, observes, that "then the Roman Pontiff had titles in common with most bishops of other cities; but that at last Gregory VII., in a Roman Synod, ordained that the name of Pope should belong to *one alone* in Christendom." It might be shown, in like manner, that the titles of *Summus Sacerdos*, *Pontifex Maximus*, and *Princeps Sacerdotum*, were anciently applied to all bishops. Pseudo-Ambros, Com. in Ephes IV., v. 1 and 12; St. Jerome Ep. ad Asellam, (No. 45 Migne.)

with Rome are the mere factors, dependents, or vassals of the Roman see. If any man doubt this, let him read their oath of office; an oath which it is matter of astonishment that any mortal should either make to another, or suffer to be made to himself:

“I, N., elect of the Church of N., from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our lord, the lord N. Pope N. and to his successors, canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do any thing that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman papacy, and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the Apostolic See, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman Church, any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and as soon as I can, will signify it to our said lord, or to some other, by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose. I will come to a council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the apostles every three years; and give an account to our lord and his foresaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things anywise belonging to the state of my Church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto specially impowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or in default of these, by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy, [of the diocese] by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above-mentioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the foresaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell, nor give away,

nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor anywise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and these holy Gospels of God."

Thus the appointed guardians and governors of the Church of Christ have betrayed their trust, and sold themselves to the Court of Rome to be the tools of a worldly policy. It is impossible that religious or civil liberty should flourish in any country in which this system prevails, or that abuses, corruptions, and superstitions, should be eradicated, while the maintenance of them subserves the interest of the Roman Court. It was by this means that the Popes of Rome were enabled to defeat the movement for reformation in the sixteenth century; openly opposing it as long as they could; yielding at length from necessity to the call for a general council; and then managing, by means of their Italian bishops, many, if not most of them, mere titulars, to put down by a vote of almost three to one whatever reforms the French and Spanish diocesans honestly but timidly proposed. Thus the roots of all abuses were left; only the tops for appearance sake were lopped off; and the Reformation on the Continent, which should have been promoted on principle and with sobriety within the Church, was brought into contempt by being turned over to the Protestants, to be pursued with passion and blind zeal without the Church.

2. This obstacle is the greater from the fact that the theology commonly taught in the churches in communion with the See of Rome, has been skilfully contrived and adapted to the very purpose of elevating the papacy by depressing the episcopacy. Before the reformation, the canonists and the schoolmen wrought together for the elevation of the Roman see. The former carried matters to the highest pitch, flattering the Popes with the conceit, that as the vicegerents of CHRIST, who was the Lord of the whole earth, they had dominion over all nations, and could alone bestow a just and valid title to kings and princes over the countries which they governed. That remarkable work, "The Convocation Book, of A. D. 1606," commonly called Bishop Overall's Convocation Book, by its profound and elaborate refutation of the theories which the canonists had constructed for concentrating all temporal as well as spiritual power in the Popes of Rome, is a monument of the hold which these theories once had over the minds of the learned. The English Reformation has con-

signed this class of writers to oblivion. The subtleties of the schoolmen, though less ambitious, have been more enduring, and are still of avail to divert the governing power of the Church from the episcopacy, where CHRIST placed, and where the ancient Church preserved it, and fix it in the papacy. The power of creating the *true body* of Christ, is superior to the power of governing the *mystical body*, and consequently the latter must be subordinate to the former. Hence the common opinion in the Roman schools that bishop and priest are one order; that ordination to the priesthood, indeed, fixes a man in an immutable station, and confers on him an irrevocable power, (in technical language, *imprints an indelible character*;) but that consecration to the episcopate does nothing of the sort; that it raises the presbyter to no higher order than he had before, but merely confers on him an office, the powers of which are mutable and revocable.\* Thus the bishops are placed at the disposal of the Pope as clay in the hands of the potter. They are much or nothing, as he pleases to make them.

In effect, the divine institution of episcopacy, or the doctrine that bishops received their power of government immediately from Christ

\* This fanciful doctrine—fanciful in its origin, though only too practical in its results—is thus clearly stated by a divine of our Church, in the reign of Elizabeth, Bishop Downham. See more on the same subject in Dr. Marshall's *Constitution of the Church*, A. D. 1716.

“It is true that some popish writers make bishops and presbyters but one order; but you must withal take the reason of that popish conceit. They hold, the sacrament of the altar, as they call it, is the sacrament of sacraments, whereunto the sacrament of order is subordinate, all their orders of clerks being ordained to the ministry of the altar: And that every one of their several orders (all which they call sacraments) is only to be accounted a sacrament, as it hath reference to the Eucharist: To which purpose Thomas Aquinas did somewhat ridiculously distinguish their several orders, (*Secunda Secunda*, q. 44, and in his *Supplement*, q. 37, 2 c.,) accordingly as their divers offices referred to that sacrament: And inasmuch as by that whole power of order, this is the supreme act, by pronouncing the words of consecration, to make the very body of Christ, which is as well performed by a priest as by a bishop; therefore they teach, that the bishops and priests are both of one order; and that the order, as it is a sacrament, is not superior to that of presbyters, but only as it is an office in respect of sacred actions: And, in this sense, Thomas says, that the bishop having power in sacred and hierarchical actions, in respect of Christ's mystical body, above the priest, the office of a bishop is an order: For you must understand that they make all ecclesiastical power to have reference to the body of Christ; either *verum*, his true body, in the sacrament of the altar, which they call the power of order; or *mysticum*, mystical, (that is, the true Church, and members thereof,) which they call the power of jurisdiction.”

by their consecration, has long since been exploded from the Roman schools, and is as much decried by Romanists as it is by Presbyterians and Independents. Indeed, there is scarcely an argument produced by the latter against Episcopacy, for fear it might lead to the papacy, which had not before been used by Bellarmine and other Jesuits against the same Episcopacy, for fear it would subvert the papacy.\* In the Council of Trent, the French and Spanish bishops, made an honest effort for the truth, but they were defeated by the Italians, who well understood that to acknowledge the divine institution of Episcopacy would be destructive of the papal supremacy.†

3. Another obstacle to reform is the passionate and indiscriminate way in which the Church of Rome is generally assailed. Instead of regarding *Poper*y as consisting of *additions* made to the Catholic faith in corrupt and ignorant times, the origin and growth of which are to be traced *historically* with a view to their removal, the assailants, for the most part, look upon the abuses as logical developments, which can be most effectually dealt with by denying the principles from which they are supposed to flow. Hence the common opinion that the Church of England contains all the elements of *Poper*y, only that she does not, like the Church of Rome, consistently act them out! Besides, the assailants, for the most part, have no idea of the Christian Faith as

\* For a comparative view of the opinions of Romanists and Presbyterians on this subject, with full quotations from authors on both sides, see Bishop Sage's *Vindication of Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, chap. ix., sec. 24, to the end of the chapter.

† Richerius, as quoted by Lawrence Howel in his *History of the Popes*, gives a valuable letter, illustrative of this point, of Claudius Sanctius, a doctor of the Sorbonne, (who attended the council in company with Cardinal Lothneranus,) to Espensæus, his brother Sorbonnist: "You never were more fortunate than in not coming hither. For had you seen the vile practices here to check the Reformation, it would have broken your heart. The French were more sincere and industrious in it than others, who now laugh at us for the misfortunes France labours under, as if the civil wars were a just judgment on her. We arrived here when the argument in hand was about Holy Orders. The Spanish bishops solicited earnestly that the synod would declare Episcopacy an institution of CHRIST; and that bishops were by divine right superior to priests. In which the French heartily concurred with them. But to prevent the consequence of this honest proposition, the Italians propose and carry several canons in favour of the Pope, in opposition to what the Spanish bishops urged; by which they pretend the Pope to be the Bishop immediately ordained of Christ, and that all other bishops have no power but what is dependent of the power of the Pope, or of the Pope himself. It is impossible for me to tell you particularly what I have seen and heard in this council. I wish, though at the peril of my life, I were in the Sorbonne.—*Trent, June 15th, 1563.*"

an objective reality, or of the Christian Church as a divine institution; faith with them being no more than their own inward persuasion, the Church a thing of their own creation, and both evanescent, shifting, ephemeral. Hence they dash forward with intemperate zeal, and think they are cutting up Popery by the roots, when they strike at the apostolical succession, the sacraments, forms, every thing indeed which gives fixedness and permanency to religion. The consequence is, that Romanists cling to their errors and abuses for the sake of the truth, from which they are thus taught to think them inseparable, and cling to them with a tenacity proportioned to the vehemence with which they are assailed; while dispassionate but uninstructed Protestants, seeing the issue thus virtually made between Romanism and infidelity, are naturally led to prefer a system which has many faults to one which has no virtues.

4. Another obstacle is the divisions of Protestants, who count well nigh as many "churches" as opinions; every man, whom the lust of power and popularity moves to be a leader, making his favourite crotchet the foundation of a "church." The Romanists contrast this state of things with their own, and make it an argument for their centre of unity. Really there is no force in the argument; for if the papal supremacy be not, and if Episcopacy be a divine institution, there is neither reason nor faith in relying on the former; it is a human prop, and must finally break; for whatever Cardinal Pallavicini and other Italians may have thought, or may think to the contrary, CHRIST will live longer than Aristotle. Besides, there are two facts which are an effectual offset against Protestant divisions: first, that the oriental churches, under their metropolitans and patriarchs, maintain as firm a union as the Latin churches under their Pope; and, secondly, that the Anglican and its derived churches, do not, at the present day, in the fourth century of their deliverance from the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction, present a single instance of schism. I mean that in Great Britain, in her extensive colonies, "on which the sun never sets," and in the United States, there is no Church deriving its orders from the Anglican Church which is not in communion with the Anglican Church. The divisions of Protestants are, indeed, a startling fact, and tell powerfully on the imagination; but in respect to the comparative efficacy of *co-ordinate* or *republican* communion, as maintained in the Greek and Anglican churches, and of *monarchical* union as upheld by the papal churches, they are utterly irrelevant and beside the mark.

## U.—Page, 40.

I was not surprised at the defection of Bishop Ives, but I was surprised to learn from his valedictory letter to his diocese, that he had entertained doubts about the validity of his orders. Annexed is the letter as it appeared in the *Churchman* of 19th of February last :

“ROME, *Wednesday, Dec. 22, 1852.*

“DEAR BRETHREN :—Some of you, at least, are aware that for years doubts of the validity of my office as Bishop have at times harassed my mind and greatly enfeebled my action. At other times, it is true, circumstances have arisen to overrule these doubts, and to bring to my mind temporary relief. But it has been only temporary ; for, in spite of resolutions to abandon the reading and the use of Catholic books ; in spite of earnest prayers and entreaties that God would protect my mind against the distressing influence of Catholic Truth ; and in spite of public and private professions and declarations, which in times of suspended doubt I sincerely made to shield myself from suspicion, and win back the confidence of my diocese, which had been well nigh lost—in spite of all this, and of many other considerations which would rise up before me, as the necessary consequence of suffering my mind to be carried forward in the direction in which my doubts pointed, these doubts would again return with increased and almost overwhelming vigour, goading me at times to the very borders of derangement.

“Under these doubts, I desired temporary relief from duties that had become so disquieting to me, and determined to accompany Mrs. Ives, whose health demanded a change of climate, in a short absence abroad. But absence has brought no relief to my mind. Indeed, the doubts that disturbed it have grown into clear and settled convictions ; so clear and settled, that, without a violation of conscience and honour, and every obligation of duty to God and His Church, I can no longer remain in my position.

“I am called upon, therefore, to do an act of self-sacrifice, in view of which all other self-sacrificing acts of my life are less than nothing ; called upon to sever the ties which have been strengthened by long years of love and forbearance, which have bound my heart to many of you, as was David’s to that of Jonathan, and make my heart bleed as my hand traces the sentence which separates all pastoral relation between us, and conveys to you the knowledge that I hereby resign into your hands my office as Bishop of North Carolina ; and, further, that I am determined to make my submission to the Catholic Church.

“In addition, (my feelings will allow me only to say,) as this act is earlier than any perception of my own, and antedates, by some months, the expiration of the time for which I so promptly received from members of your body an advance of salary, I hereby renounce all claim upon the same, and acknowledge myself bound, on an inti-

mation of your wish, to return whatever you may have advanced to me beyond this 22d day of December.

"With continued affection and esteem, I pray you to allow me still to subscribe myself,

"Your faithful friend, etc.,

"L. SILLIMAN IVES."

What was in the mind of Bishop Ives when he penned this letter can only be known to us from the letter itself; and from this it appears that before his fall he had entertained doubts about *the validity of his office as bishop*; by which I, of course, understand him to mean the validity of his orders. Not a word about heresy, or schism, or the unlawfulness of his episcopal ministrations; his doubts respected the validity of his episcopal orders; a mere question of fact, which any man fit to serve on a jury might, with competent sources of information, have determined in less time than it takes to try half the questions of fact in our common courts. "These doubts," however, had "harassed" the mind of the learned bishop "for years." After an occasional respite, "these doubts" about the validity of his orders "would return with increased and overwhelming vigour, goading him at times to the very borders of derangement." Under the pressure of "these doubts," Bishop Ives went abroad; but

Patriæ quis exul,  
Se quoque fugit ?

"these doubts" had become a second nature and part of himself, and of course "absence" from his native country "brought no relief to his mind." He tells us, indeed, that "after a change of climate," "these doubts," whether or no he had ever been validly ordained, "have grown into clear and settled convictions" that he had not been. But how long "these doubts" and "clear convictions" alternated before the latter became "settled," we are left to conjecture; what is certain is, that at Rome, on the 22d of December, he relinquished all legal claim to the salary that he had received in advance, which may be taken as proof, that on that day, thanks to an Italian sky! the "doubts" disappeared, and the "clear convictions" shone forth with a lustre which was "settled" and "disturbed" by no further "doubts" until the hour of his writing the letter.

The same number of the Churchman which contains the letter of Bishop Ives, contains also the following definite statement from *L'Univers*, a Romanist paper published in France, which has not, to my knowledge, been contradicted by Bishop Ives or his friends :

“Dr. Ives left America some weeks ago, to go and make his solemn abjuration of the errors of Protestantism at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff. Before his departure he gave his retraction into the hands of the Archbishop of New-York, and participated in the sacraments of the Church; but the venerable convert wished this act to be kept secret in order to procure from Pius IX. the sweet consolation of himself receiving him into his flock. However, considering the possibility that he might be lost on his voyage, Dr. Ives gave to Archbishop Hughes his abjuration in writing, furnished with the most incontestible characters of authenticity, in order that this document might be made public in case of accident.”

I leave it to the charity of others to shield Bishop Ives from the guilt of duplicity by the misfortune of insanity. I am concerned with neither. In truth, (for I have yet a hope that the statement in the Romanist paper may be denied or qualified,) I believe in neither; but I believe Bishop Ives to possess a mind over the surface of which (and it is all surface) clear convictions and distressing doubts about a simple matter of fact may chase each other for years in the quick succession of clouds and sunshine on an April day. I believe this, because his letter proves it; and all my concern is to show that the validity of his orders, respecting which (as he himself tells us) his doubts and convictions have kept him on the rack for years, is a mere question of fact, which a man of common sense and honest purpose might determine, without losing his health and losing his wits, and then taking a voyage to Europe for the recovery (I hope) of the one, but in the vain pursuit of the other.

I had not supposed, indeed, that any man, who, with honest purpose and competent means of information, had looked into the question of the Anglican orders, could entertain a doubt of their validity; and that a man of learning and piety, who had been promoted to the highest rank in the Church, and called to preside over one of our largest dioceses, should be perplexed on the subject, and driven “to the very borders of derangement,” I cannot but regard as an instance of idiosyncrasy more fit for the study of the physician than the divine. In themselves, and for any effect they may have on us, the Romish objections to our orders are contemptible; but there is one point of view in which they are deserving of attention, and that is, as they illustrate the temper and spirit of the Romish Church, and have been the occasion of involving it in the deepest guilt; and this must be my apology for a more extended note on the subject than I should otherwise have made.

To understand the matter, the reader will be pleased to call to

mind the distinction already noted between Orders and Jurisdiction. Ordination, or, as it is commonly termed among us, Consecration, is all that is necessary to make a man a bishop. In order, however, to the lawful exercise of jurisdiction, it is further necessary that he be *confirmed*, i. e., settled or established in the exercise of his functions under certain limitations needful to the preservation of unity. In the English and American churches, bishops are *confirmed* in the dioceses to which they are respectively chosen, by the highest spiritual authority recognized by these churches; and Romanists, even if they admitted the validity of our orders, would still deny our jurisdiction, and consequently the lawfulness of our ministrations, on the ground of our Bishops not having received confirmation from the Bishop of Rome; who, as they fancy, is entitled to supreme jurisdiction in Great Britain and the United States, and indeed throughout all the earth, as well as in Italy. A claim so extravagant refutes itself; and hence the necessity of denying, not only the lawfulness of our ministrations, but the validity of our orders: by which is meant that they deny the *fact* that our bishops have ever received orders, and affirm that the orders to which they pretend, have no existence, but are null and void.

Catching at everything upon which they can raise the semblance of an argument to help their cause, Romanists deny that the form used in the ordinal of Edward VI. was sufficient to confer the episcopal office. The form was, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness." It must be confessed, that words which express the specific office intended to be conferred would be better; and hence, in 1662, the words were altered, and the form now in use was adopted: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. And remember," &c., as above. Probably the only reason of our Church having at first used so brief and general a form, is, that she had then but just begun her reformation from Popery; and certainly the fact of her now using a more expressive form, is owing to her having continued and proceeded in that reformation. For the form which accompanies the imposition of hands in the Roman Pontifical for the consecration of a bishop, is simply, "Take the Holy Ghost," *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*; and to the objection now brought by Romanists against the sufficiency of

the form in the Ordinal of Edward VI., we give the same answer which Vasquez,\* one of themselves, has given to the same objection against the sufficiency of their own form; viz., that though the words do not express the power intended to be conferred, yet the circumstances which accompany the words do express it; the whole office for the consecration of bishops; showing formally and expressly the power or gift conferred by the words which accompany the imposition of hands.

But in order to cut up our ordinations by the roots, the Romanists tell us that Archbishop PARKER, through whom we derive our succession of orders, had not even the benefit of any serious form; that his consecration was a jest and a mockery, dispatched at a tavern.

The reader may think that this story is credited only by the more vulgar of the Romanists. No; it has been received and endorsed at Rome, and is the precise ground on which the Bishop of Rome and his conclave have ruled against the validity of Anglican Orders. It is well, therefore, briefly to review the facts connected with Parker's consecration.

During the reign of Queen Mary, Reginald Pole was *de facto* Archbishop of Canterbury, having been schismatically intruded by the Pope of Rome. Pole died on the same day with Queen Mary, so that on the accession of Elizabeth, the See of Canterbury was vacant. MATTHEW PARKER was the next incumbent of that See. The Romanists say that he was not *lawfully* in possession, and had no *right* to the See. This assertion we care nothing about; it rests on their assumption, that all spiritual jurisdiction on earth proceeds from the Pope of Rome; and we dismiss it, with the counter assertion, that Parker was the true and lawful successor to Cranmer, as was Cranmer to Warham; and that Pole, being a mere intruder, is not to be named, except as having had possession *in fact*. But the Romanists have also labored to create a doubt about Parker's consecration; and this, indeed, is a point of consequence, and that to which I would direct attention. Parker, in fact, succeeded Pole in the See of Canterbury, and continued in possession to the time of his death. This is not denied; the only question is, whether he was consecrated to the office of bishop, or entered on the duties of his office without consecration. I propose first to show the sense of the English nation and Church at that time, as to the necessity of

\* Disp. 240. c. 5. n. 60. I give the reference after Burnet, in his "Vindication of the Ordinations," &c.

consecration before a man could be accounted a bishop, and then to give a synopsis of the testimony which proves the fact of consecration in the case of Parker.

1. The sense of the English nation and Church may be best known from the laws of Parliament, and the official and synodical acts of the clergy.

The 25 Henry VIII., cap. 20., sect. 5., enacts that, whenever a presentment or nomination is made by the king, "Then every archbishop and bishop, into whose hands any such presentment and nomination shall be directed, shall, with all speed and celerity, invest and consecrate the person nominated and presented by the king's highness, his heirs or successors, to the office and dignity that such person shall be so presented unto, and give and use unto him pall, and all other benedictions, ceremonies, and things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring, or obtaining hereafter any bulls, or other things at the See of Rome for any such office or dignity in that behalf. And then after he hath made such oath and fealty duly to the king's majesty, his heirs and successors, as shall be limited for the same, the king's highness, by his letters patent under his great seal, shall signify the said election to one archbishop and two other bishops, or else to four bishops within this realm, or within any other the king's dominions, to be assigned by the king's highness, his heirs or successors, requiring and commanding the said archbishop and bishops with all speed and celerity, to confirm the said election, and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected, to the office and dignity that he is elected unto, and to give and use to him such pall, benedictions, ceremonies, and all other things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring or obtaining any bulls, briefs, or other things at the said See of Rome, or by the authority thereof in any behalf." And after some further matter in regard to the temporalities, it is enacted, in conclusion, that every person "doing contrary to this act, shall run in the dangers, pains and penalties of the statute of Provision and *Premunire*, made in the five-and-twentieth year of the reign of King Edward III., and in the sixteenth year of King Richard II."

In 1 Edward VI., c. 2., (1547) certain modifications, with a view to prevent delay, and to lessen costs and charges, are made in the election of bishops and collation to their sees. It is then enacted: "And, thereupon, the said person to whom the archbishopric, or bishopric, or suffraganship is so conferred, collated or given, may be consecrated, and sue his livery, or *ouster les mains*, and do other

things as well as if the said ceremonies and elections had been done and made."

The 3 Edward VI., c. 2., (1549) enacts, that "Such form and manner of making and consecrating of archbishops, bishops, priests and deacons, and other ministers of the Church, as by six prelates and six other men of this realm learned in God's law, by the king to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them, shall be devised for that purpose, and set forth under the great seal before the first of April next coming, shall be lawfully exercised and used, and none other."

In 1552, an act was passed in Parliament, establishing the revised Book of Common Prayer; and "Adding also a form and manner of making and consecrating of archbishops, bishops, priests and deacons, to be of like force, authority and value as the same like aforesaid book, entitled, *The Book of Common Prayer* was before, and to be accepted, received, used and esteemed in like sort and manner." The Book of Common Prayer had been established in 1549, and by this act of 1552, the Ordinal, or form of consecrating bishops and ordering priests and deacons, is annexed to it, and the use of it, to the exclusion of all other forms, is made obligatory.

The preceding acts were repealed under Mary; but in the first year of Elizabeth, the statute of repeal was abrogated, so far as respected "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies in the Church of England;" and it was enacted, "That the said Book, with the order of service, and of the administration of the sacraments, rites and ceremonies, with the alterations and additions therein added and appointed by this estatute, shall stand and be, from and after the said Feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, in full force and effect, according to the tenor and effect of this estatute, any thing in the aforesaid estatute of repeal to the contrary notwithstanding." The "alterations and additions" respected the Sunday Lessons, the Litany, and the sentences in the delivery of the elements to communicants, and had no reference to the Ordinal.

These acts prove the sense of the nation, and in regard to the sense of the clergy suffice it to state: 1. That the twelve commissioners who drew up the Ordinal were all taken from the clergy. Six of them, Crammer, Goodrich, Holbeck, Skyp, Thirleby and Ridley were all bishops; and the other six were Coxe, afterwards Bishop of Ely; Taylor, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln; May, Dean of St. Paul's; Heyns, Dean of Exeter; Robertson, Archdeacon of Leicester; and

Redmayne, Archdeacon of Taunton. 2. That in 1552, the Articles of Religion were agreed upon in Convocation, in which these forms of consecrating and ordaining are sanctioned as *very pious, and agreeable to the wholesome doctrine of the gospel*. To this may be added, that in 1562 the Convocation adopted this very article, in substance, but put it in a much stronger form; the 36th article then agreed upon, the title of which is, "Of consecration of Bishops and Ministers," being that "The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of Priests and Deacons lately set forth in the time of Edward VI., and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary for such consecration and ordering; neither hath it any thing that is of itself superstitious and ungodly, and, therefore, whosoever are consecrated and ordered according to the rites of that Book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered." For albeit this article was adopted some two years after the consecration of Parker, it may yet be taken as an indication of the sense of the Church at the time of his consecration; and indeed its bearing on the case is strengthened by the fact that Archbishop Parker himself sat at the head of that very Convocation which sanctioned by its synodical act the impressive form of Consecration prescribed in the Ordinal.

These acts show very plainly the sense of the Church and nation as to the necessity of consecration; and they prove, I apprehend, that no man could, in those times, have been recognized as a bishop in the Church of England who had not been solemnly consecrated to his office by bishops, agreeably to the form provided for that purpose in the Ordinal. This was the *law* of the Church and the land; and under this law a man could no more steal into the office of bishop then than now; nor could any man not solemnly consecrated to the episcopal office by bishops agreeably to the Ordinal, have any more been then made Archbishop of Canterbury, than under our present laws a woman or a Roman Cardinal can be made President of the United States.

2. I come now to give a brief synopsis of the direct proofs of the fact of Parker's consecration.

On the 18th of July, 1559, which was soon after the accession of Elizabeth, the *conge d'elire* was issued to the Chapter of Canterbury, and on August 1st of the same year, Matthew Parker was elected to

that See. Both instruments are extant, and given in the works treating on the subject.

On the 6th of December of the same year, (the bishops of Queen Mary having been all deprived of their sees, except Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff,) a commission was issued to seven bishops, empowering them, or a majority of their number, to confirm Parker's election, and to consecrate him to the office of bishop. The names of the bishops included in this commission, were Kitchen, Barlow, Scorye, Coverdale, Hodgkins, Salesbury and Bale. Kitchen was at the time Bishop of Llandaff. Barlow, Scorye and Coverdale had been bishops respectively of Bath, Chichester and Exeter, in King Edward's time, but had been deprived of their sees under Mary. Hodgkins and Salesbury were suffragan bishops of Bedford and Thetford; and Bale was Bishop of Ossory. The commission is extant, and published in the books treating on this subject.\*

On the 9th of December of the same year, Barlow, Scorye, Coverdale and Hodgkins confirmed the election of Parker; and the certificate of the fact may be seen in the books treating on the subject.

On December 17th, of the same year, the four bishops above

\* In the conclusion of the Letters-Patent creating this commission, is a clause supplying by royal authority defects which the exigency of the times might require to be supplied in carrying out the commission. Romanists are fond of nibbling at this clause, as if it were intended to supply that very power of ordination or consecration which by Divine Institution is vested exclusively in the bishops of the Church, and which, because of its being so limited by *divine institution*, no parliamentary statutes nor ecclesiastical laws, nor any human authority, can possibly supply. The statesmen of that day, however, knew their province too well to be guilty of any such egregious and presumptuous folly, and hence the defects to be supplied are limited, by express words, to those which might arise from the statute or ecclesiastical laws of the realm; *supplentes, &c., si quid \* \* \* desit aut deerit eorum, quae per statuta hujus regni, aut per leges ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur*. The explanation is found in the fact that some of the bishops to whom the commission is addressed had been deprived of their sees under Mary, and had either not been elected to, or not put in possession of, other sees at the time the commission was issued. The clause is indeed peculiar to this commission, and is in a manner required by its opening sentence, which directs the commission, not as is usual to diocesan bishops, but to bishops, some of whom had, at the time, no dioceses under their charge; as for instance, to Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath, now Bishop Elect of Chichester, and to Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter. "Regina, &c., Reverendis, in Christo Patribus Antonio Landav. Episcopo, Willielmo Barloo quondam Bathon. Episcopo, nunc Cicast. electo, Johanni Scorye, quondam Cicast. episcopo, nunc Herefordensi [electo] Mil. Coverdale quondam Exoniensi episcopo, Ricardo Bedfordensi, &c.

named, viz., Barlow, Scorye, Coverdale and Hodgkins, consecrated MATTHEW PARKER in the Chapel of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth, using the form which had been set forth in the reign of Edward VI. The record of the consecration was entered in the Archbishop's register, and the original copy of the act is still preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. It may be seen in most of the books on Anglican Orders.

The fact of the consecration is mentioned in contemporary histories; in Hollingshead's *Chronicle* and Camden's *Elizabeth*; by the latter in these words: "Matthew Parker, a religious and learned man, and of most modest manners, who, being chaplain to King Henry VIII., had been Dean of the Collegiate Church of Stoke-Clare; he was solemnly elected to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and consecrated at Lambeth, after a sermon and invocation of the Holy Ghost, and celebration of the Eucharist, by the laying on of the hands of three Bishops, William Barlowe, formerly Bishop of Bath; John Scorye, formerly Bishop of Chichester; Miles Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter, and of John, suffragan of Bedford."

Archbishop Parker afterwards consecrated and confirmed Grindall, Cox, Sands, Merrick, Young, Bullingham, Jewell, Davis, Guest, Barkley, Bentham, Alley, Parkhurst, Horne, Cheney, and Scambler; and he confirmed Barlowe in the See of Chichester, and Scorye in the See of Hereford. These men afterwards took possession of their sees, and enjoyed them during their lives; and, of course, (Browne's *Nag's Head Fable*, p. 168,) the fact of their being duly confirmed and consecrated must have been certified to the government before they could be admitted to do homage, and be installed in their episcopal chairs, and have a writ to be put in possession of their temporalities.

I will only add, that seven years afterwards, *i. e.*, in the year 1566, an act of Parliament was passed, in which it is declared that the queen had "caused divers and sundry grave and well-learned men to be duly elected, made and consecrated archbishops and bishops of divers archbishopricks and bishopricks within this realm, and other her majesty's dominions and countries, according to such order and form, with such ceremonies in and about their consecration," as are prescribed in the *Book of Common Prayer*; and enacting "that all persons that have been, or shall be made, ordered or consecrated archbishops, priests, ministers of God's Holy Word and sacraments, or deacons, after the form and order prescribed in the said order and form, how archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons and ministers should

be consecrated, made and ordered, be in very deed, and also by authority hereof, declared and enacted to be, and shall be archbishops, bishops, priests, ministers and deacons, and rightly made, ordered and consecrated; any statute, law, canon, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding." The manifest purpose of the statute is to bring the bishops, whose consecration it acknowledges, under the protection of the State, to guard them in their legal privileges, and to shield them from cavil and prosecution in the temporal courts; and the Romanists show stark ignorance, or something worse than ignorance, when they represent it as intended to supply the want of consecration. The statute is alone and of itself a sufficient proof of Parker's consecration.

Not so much for proof (though proof it is) as to enliven these dry details with a breath of the devout and heavenly spirit of the good and great man who has thus been set up as a mark for papistical scoffers and revilers, I give the following extract (which has been often before published) from a parchment roll preserved in Christ Church College, Cambridge, and containing, in the form of a diary the principal events of Archbishop Parker's life, all written in his own hand:

1559, 17.—Decembr. Ann. 1559.—Consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum cantuarien.

Heu! Heu! Domine Deus in quæ tempora servasti me? Jam veni in profundum aquarum, & tempestas demersit me.

O! Domine vim patior, responde pro me, & spiritu tuo principali confirma me. Homo enim sum, & exigui temporis, & minor, &c.

Da mihi fidium tuarum, &c.

Such is an outline of the evidence in favour of Parker's consecration. The Church and the nation, as proved by their synodical and parliamentary acts, believing that no man could be made bishop without being consecrated, and after a solemn form, by bishops, creating an invincible necessity that he should be consecrated before he could take possession, as no one has ever denied that he did take possession, of the See of Canterbury. The fact of his consecration, attested by public records and contemporary history; received, without a doubt, by a communion, the fundamental principle of which is the fact of an unbroken succession in the order of bishops, and a large proportion, not to say a majority, of whose clergy have believed in the necessity of that succession to the very being of a Christian Church; never questioned by Puritans, the bitter enemies of the doctrine of apostolical succession, and of the claim made to it by

the Anglican Church; and admitted, as we shall presently see, by Romanists of great name, in opposition to the stream of their own communion, and constrained by the mere force of truth.

And now what has the Church of Rome, speaking at Rome and through the mouth of her "Sovereign Pontiff," to offer in disproof of Archbishop Parker's consecration? The herd of writers who are subject to the Bishop of Rome, impugn Parker's consecration, as we have seen, both on ritual and historical grounds, denying the sufficiency of the form used in the consecration, and setting up a counter statement in opposition to that attested by the public records of the Church and nation. But the Church of Rome itself, as I shall now show, was debarred from the former ground, and therefore driven of necessity on the latter.

On the accession of Mary, Pope Julius III. appointed Cardinal Pole *Legate de Latere* from the Roman see, with full power and authority to reconcile England to the Church of Rome. Of the English clergy then living, some had received orders under Henry VIII., and others under Edward VI.; the former, both bishops and clergy, having been ordained according to the Roman forms, and the latter according to the ordinal of Edward VI. This Bull of Julius III. to Cardinal Pole, (which is given by Burnet, vol. iii. fol. ed., p. 215 of the records,) mentions expressly the bishops and archbishops who had received their livings from the hand of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; puts no distinction between the ordinations performed according to the Roman Pontifical, and those performed according to the ritual of the English Church; but provides that both, when reconciled to the Roman see and re-habilitated, shall be admitted, if worthy and fit in other respects, to preside as bishops and archbishops over the Cathedrals and Metropolitan sees, to rule and govern the same in spirituals and temporals, and to exercise the functions of their episcopal office. To remove all difficulties, however, a dispensation is granted, under favour of which Presbyters, even though irregularly ordained, (evidently referring to those ordained by the English ordinal,) might be reinstated, and serve in their order and receive episcopal consecration, without receiving the priesthood anew; a plain recognition of the validity of their orders; since, had their orders been accounted null, a dispensation, which extends only to human, and never to divine laws, could not have supplied the defect.

This Bull to Cardinal Pole, virtually acknowledging the validity of the orders conferred according to the ordinal of Edward VI., was dated at Rome, A. D. 1554: five years afterwards, Parker was con-

secrated by the same ordinal ; and when the question of the validity of Parker's consecration, and of the bishops deriving from him, was distinctly submitted to the judgment of the Roman see, it came up and was determined, not on ritual, but on historical grounds. In other words, the fact of Parker's consecration, attested as it is by all the proofs of which a fact is capable, was denied. And on what grounds was it denied ? What was the counter statement, and by what testimony supported, which availed in the judgment of the Roman Church to invalidate and overthrow the authentic statement ? The reader shall have the story in the words in which it was first published, A. D. 1604, or just forty-five years after Parker's consecration, by the Jesuit Holywood :

"In the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the bishops of the sectaries were to be made. They that wanted ordination (*candidati*) met at London, at an inn in the street called Cheapside, at the sign of the Nag's Head, and together with them came the old simple Bishop of Landaff, (*Landasensis*, as it is the Latin all along,) to give them orders. Which, as soon as Bonner, (*Bonnerus*,) then Dean of the bishops in England, came to understand, he sent his chaplain from the Tower, (where he was imprisoned for his religion,) to command Landaff, under pain of excommunication, not to ordain the new bishops. By which menace, Landaff, being frightened, drew back, and making use of many pretences, avoided the sacrilegious ordination. Hereupon the persons waiting for orders (*candidati*) began to be in a great rage, to abuse Landaff, and to consider of taking new measures. To say no more, Scory, the monk, afterwards the mock-Bishop of Hereford, imposes hands upon the rest, and some of them impose hands upon Scory, and so the children are born without a father, and the father is begotten by the children, a thing never heard of in any age before. This Thomas Neale, reader of the Hebrew tongue at Oxford, who was present, related to the old confessors for religion, and they to me. And the story is confirmed by its being afterwards enacted in Parliament that these parliamentary prelates should be esteemed lawful bishops."\*

Neal was Bonner's chaplain ; and Bonner was indicted at the King's Bench for refusing to acknowledge the jurisdiction of Horne, (who was consecrated by Parker,) and had two of the greatest lawyers in the kingdom to manage his defence ; but neither then nor ever afterwards have we a word of this ridiculous story from Bonner. Harding,

\* See Browne's *Story of the Ordination*, &c., p. 9.

Stapleton and Sanders flourished at the time, but not a syllable of the story is found in them or any other Romish author before its publication by Holywood; and though afterwards several of these authors repeat the story on the authority of the same Thomas Neal, yet they all report it with different and even contradictory particulars. A story like this, which has vulgarity and falsehood stamped on its face; which was attested at the time of its publication by no living witness, but was exhaled and blown about on the hearsays of hearsays, (for Holywood had it from the "old confessors," and the "old confessors" had it from Thomas Neal); which sought, but sought in vain, to get some semblance of truth from the impudent charge of forgery which its partisans have brought against the most solemn records of a nation; a story like this, every man, I apprehend, who had no sinister end to answer by its propagation, would dismiss at once as "a silly fable and abominable scandal."

But the reader will require proof that this absurd fable has been formally adopted by the Church of Rome, and he shall have it; only let us first do that justice to the Romanists as to confess that some of them have risen above the spirit of cavil and gossip which their leaders have shown in this matter.

Cudsemius, who travelled in England during the reign of Elizabeth, and wrote a treatise *De Desp. Calvin. Causa*, printed A. D. 1609, has this remarkable passage :\*

"As respects the state of the Calvinistic† sect in England, it is so constituted that it may either last a long time or be suddenly and rapidly dissolved; and the reason is, that they have there the Catholic order in the perpetual series of their bishops, and a lawful succession of pastors; in honour of which we are wont to call the English Calvinists schismatics, instead of applying to them the harsher term of heretics."

\* I have merely translated the passage from Cudsemius as I find it in Dr. Elrington, (to whom also I am indebted for the extracts from Peter Walsh,) and subjoin the original:

"Quod Calvinianæ sectæ in Angliâ statum attinet, ille ita comparatus est ut vel admodum longo tempore durare posset, vel etiam subito & repente mutari, propter Catholicum ibidem in perpetua Episcoporum suorum serie, legitimâque pastorum successione, ab ecclesiâ acceptâ ordinem, ob cujus honorem Anglos Calvinistas mitiore vocabulo non hereticos, sed schismaticos appellare solemus."

† "12mo. Maguntia, 1609, c. xi., p. 121. We know that Calvin was not the founder of the English Reformation, but the classing all the Reformed Churches together is no uncommon mistake."—*Dr. Elrington.*

The celebrated Peter Walsh, in an introductory discourse to his *History of the Irish Remonstrance*, makes the following remarks :

“In that place where I seem somewhat too severe on Matthew Parker, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, under Queen Elizabeth, you must not persuade yourself I do at all reflect upon his ordination, as if indeed that had been not only uncanonical or unlawful, but really void and null, or (as the schoolmen speak) invalid : were I to deliver my opinion of this matter, or were it my purpose to speak thereof, I would certainly hold myself obliged in conscience (for any thing I know yet) to concur with them who doubt not the ordination of bishops, priests, and deacons, in the Protestant Church of England, to be (at least) valid. And yet I have read all whatever hath been to the contrary objected by Roman Catholic writers, whether against the matter or form, or want of power in the first consecrators, by reason of their schism and heresy, or of their being deposed formerly from the sees, &c. But I have withal observed nothing of truth alleged by the objectors, which might in the least persuade any man who is acquainted with the known divinity, or doctrine of the present schools, (besides what Richardus Amarchanus long since writ, and with the annals of our Roman Church ;) unless, peradventure, he would turn so frantic at the same, as to question even the validity also of our own ordination in the said Roman Church, on pretence, forsooth, either of the form of the Sacrament altered at the pleasure of men, or succession of Bishops interrupted by so many schisms,” &c.

And the same able and learned writer afterwards, on occasion of some remarks made respecting his letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, repeats this opinion, saying, that “The ordination in the Protestant Church of England is valid, according both to the public doctrines of the Roman Catholic schools themselves, and the ancient rituals of all the Catholic Churches, Latin and Greek.”

Le Courayer, a learned divine of the Gallican Church, is remarkable as having written a set treatise in favor of the validity of the Anglican Ordinations. To these, says Dr. Elrington, may be added the names of Davenport, (Santa Clara,) Père Arnaud, Doctor Snel-laerts, Professor of History at Louvain in the latter end of the 17th century ; of the Abbé Longuerue referred to by Courayer, and Bos-suet, Bishop of Meaux.

In our own times, Dr. Lingard, the celebrated author of a work entitled “*A History of England*,” having stated vol. vii., note I, that

Parker was consecrated December 17, 1559, by Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, Suffragan of Bedford, adds :

“The ceremony was performed, though with a little variation, according to the ordinal of Edward VI. Two of the consecrators, Barlow and Hodgkins, had been ordained bishops according to the Roman Pontifical, the other two according to the reformed ordinal. (Wilkins’ Concil, iv., 198.) Of this consecration on the 17th of December, there can be no doubt; perhaps in the interval, between the refusal of the Catholic prelates and the performance of the ceremony, some meeting may have taken place at the Nag’s Head which gave rise to the story.”

I adduce these not as the testimony, whether willing or reluctant, of adversaries (for we need nothing of this sort), but as instances of individual fairness that appear in favorable contrast with the general temper of the Roman Church. It is of the proceedings of that Church that I am now to speak.

On Thursday, 17th of April, 1704, John Clement Gordon, who had been Archbishop of Glasgow, in the Episcopal Church of Scotland, (which Church, as well as ours, has derived its orders from the Church of England since the Reformation,) and was afterwards known as Abbot Gordon, having become a convert to the Roman Church, presented himself at Rome, and petitioned the Pope, Clement XI., to confer on him holy orders anew, on the ground that the orders which he had received in the Scotch Episcopal Church were null and void. The petition of Gordon, together with the action on it at Rome, is published by Le Quien *Pieces Justificatives*, p. lxi., and thence transferred by Dr. Elrington to his Appendix, lxxvii. As I am not aware that the document has ever appeared in English, I shall translate it entire :

*Memorial presented to Pope Clement XI., by the Congrégation of the Holy Office, on behalf of John Clement Gordon, who had been Bishop of Glasgow, and was desirous of being re ordained.*

**MOST BLESSED FATHER :**

John Clement Gordon, a Scotchman, lately converted to the faith at Rome, most humbly throwing himself at the feet of your Holiness, sets forth, that he obtained in his country the grade of the Episcopate, consecrated, however, by the rite of heretics. But inasmuch as he thinks consecration of this sort to be null, for the reason annexed to this petition, and earnestly desires to be admitted, from this doubtful and suspended grade, to a certain ecclesiastical state, and to serve God and the Catholic Church ; therefore,

Your Petitioner reverently supplicates that your Holiness vouchsafe to declare that ordination of this sort is unlawful and null ; and to dispense with him, that he may be able to receive holy orders by the Catholic rite. And God, &c.

*Reason why your Petitioner thinks, with the most part of Catholics, and even of the heterodox, that the ordinations of the Anglican heterodox can by no means be declared valid.*

For that they may be declared valid, it ought to be held, not doubtfully but certainly, that the pretended bishops have the true character of Episcopacy ; that they have, by some succession, received lawful ordination and consecration from the Catholic Church ; and finally, that the essential form, matter and intention, have been, and are yet, applied by these pseudo-bishops in their consecrations. For, indeed, if any of these three—to wit, character, lawful consecration and form, or intention,—be wanting, it must needs be confessed, with all theologians, that the consecration be declared null and invalid.

Now, as respects the first, the heretics, the most learned of that country (as if convinced by the light of truth) confess that there is among them no power of ordination which has not been derived upon them from the Roman Catholic Church. Bridges, the Pseudo-Bishop of Oxford, in *Defence of the Government*, &c., p. 278, frankly confesses this. These are his words : “ If our brethren will have papists to be mere laymen, we too, and all our ministers, will be mere laymen. For who ordained us ministers, but they who were of their ministry ? Unless, perchance, they will have it that ministers are made by the people,” which last the pretended minister (Ministellus) denied. He is not to be believed, however, when he asserts for his party that they had their ministry from the Catholics, inasmuch as he alleges no proof of successive ordination. But this being taken away, no traces of consecration remain among the heretics, except a ministry received from the people, or from a lay prince. And if no lawful ordination and consecration, sacerdotal or episcopal, has been derived upon them from orthodox Roman Catholic bishops, they consequently possess no character, no consecration, and are therefore unable, validly, to confer this on others. But that your Petitioner may not seem in this matter (which is the source of his doubt) to rely only on the assertions of heretics, he invincibly proves the invalidity of their consecrations by these arguments taken from history.

It is certain that, in the schism and abjuration of the true faith in England, no bishop went over to the side of the heretics, except one, Anthony Kitchin by name, Bishop of Llandaff, a comparatively weak man in doctrine and knowledge ; who, however, being deputed by Queen Elizabeth to the execrable office of ordaining, was so far from complying that he feigned himself blind, and so, unequal to the task imposed on him ; and, detesting the deed, could be prevailed on by no threats to perform it. (So Harding in *Confuta. Apolog. Part II. c. 2.*) The same thing was known to Stowe, the English chronolo-

gist—although, as we are assured by Constable, an English nobleman, in his manuscript work, p. 13, he did not dare, for fear of the government, to insert it in his Annals.

There was also, about this time, in the Tower of London, a certain Irish archbishop, whom the heretics besought, with the promise of liberty and rewards, to take pity on the destitution of their Church, and ordain for it ministers. But the good man, (says Sanders,) *De Schismate*, p. 400, *could by no means be induced to lay holy hands on the heretics, or partake of the sins of others.* When, however, the heretics saw themselves baulked of their hope, they come together, by a preconcerted plan, on an appointed day, in the year 1559, to the *Tavern of the Horse's Head*, in Cheapside-street, London, and resolve what is to be done. At length, amidst the tumult of those present, (for there were many there,) they choose John Scory, an apostate monk, not a bishop, to go through a show of ordination. He had read in the Second Book on the Church by Junius, (misprinted Tunii,) one of the reformed, chap. 4, that imposition of hands in the Church was anciently nothing else than a joining of hand to hand in token of friendship. Accordingly he orders the bye standers to fall on their knees, and taking one Parker, a layman, by the right hand, "*Up*," says he, "*my Lord Bishop of Canterbury, rise!*"

He, in like manner, ordained some of those who were present by this rite. That this so happened was attested by Thomas Neal, an eye-witness, professor of the Hebrew tongue at Oxford, to one Haberley, a friend of his, when both were living in Belgium, in exile from their country, on account of religion. There was published indeed at London, in the year 1613, that is, fifty-four years after the afore-mentioned occurrence, the book of a certain Anglican, by the name of Francis Mason; he pretended that he had found in a certain record a succession of bishops ordained by Catholics. But this is exploded by all, and no wonder, for he brings no proof of his assertion. It is, therefore, certain, that they have received no valid ordination from the true Church, and so no character, and consequently that their ordinations are invalid and null.

Add, that although any heretic had received a certain episcopal ordination and consecration by a lawful succession, (which, however, is proved by no argument,) yet still their ordinations ought to be pronounced invalid for defect of matter, form and due intention. For they use no matter, except, perhaps, the delivery of Bibles;—no lawful form—nay, they have rejected the Catholic form and changed it into this: *Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and administer His holy Sacraments*; which essentially differs from the orthodox forms. And then, what intention can possibly be formed by those who deny that Christ, or the first Church, instituted any unbloody sacrifice? And the sacrifice being removed, the priest is removed; the priest being removed, the bishop is removed; both being removed, *there are taken away*, as saith St. Jerome in his Dial. against the Luciferians, *the Church, the Faith, and the Gospel.*

Finally, it has ever been the constant use in England, that if an heretical minister returned to the bosom of the Church, he should be

accounted as a layman. Whence if he be in the marriage bond, he may remain in the same; but if he be free, and desirous to enter the ecclesiastical state, he may be ordained after the manner of other Catholics; or, if he please, he may marry, &c. Therefore, &c.

Thursday, April 17th, 1704, in the general congregation of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition, held in the Apostolic Palace at St. Peter's, before the most holy lord, our Lord Clement, by Divine Providence the eleventh Pope [of that name,] and in presence of the most eminent and most reverend lords cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, specially deputed by the Holy Apostolic See Inquisitors-General in the whole Christian commonwealth against heretical pravity:

The above-cited memorial being read, our most holy lord, the Pope aforesaid, having heard the suffrages of the same Most Eminent [persons,] decreed that the aforesaid *John Clement Gordon*, the petitioner, be promoted anew to all the orders, even the holy, and of the priesthood; and inasmuch as he has never been fortified by the sacrament of confirmation, that he be confirmed.

JOSEPH BARTOLUS, S. R.,  
*Et Universalis Inquisitionis Notarius.*  
 LOCUS † SIGILLI.

All that I wish to say on this petition I may express in the words of Dr. Elrington, merely putting his quotations from Gordon in English:

“The first request made by Gordon is, that the Pope should declare *ordination of this sort* (that conferred in the Episcopal Church of Scotland) *to be unlawful and void*. This proves beyond the possibility of doubt that no determination had previously been made upon the question of re-ordination, and establishes this petition and the investigation which it gave rise to, as the sole ground upon which the resolution, declaring our ordination to be invalid, was made; thus supplying us with the means of judging whether that determination was well or ill-founded.

“The next sentence contains a statement notoriously false, asserting that the greater part of the English Protestants themselves deemed our orders to be invalid. *Your petitioner, with the most part of the Catholics and even of the heretics, thinks that the ordinations of the heterodox Anglicans can by no means be declared valid*. To say that a large proportion of Protestants deemed our orders invalid, must have had great weight with the Pope, who unquestionably was led to consider that opinion to be a decisive proof that the Nag's Head story was believed among ourselves. There is no man acquainted with the Presbyterian controversy who does not know this assertion to be to-

tally destitute of foundation; who does not know that no Presbyterian writer ever defended the Nag's Head story, or made any objection to our orders except their being too popish.

"It should not escape observation, that this sentence expressly admits the denial of our orders not to have been universal among Roman Catholics; this the words, *with the most part of the Catholics*, plainly prove.

"The petition next states that our ordinations must be invalid, unless we have preserved the essential matter, form and intention. This is perfectly correct; but when Gordon comes to explain what he allows to be the matter used at our consecration, he chooses to forget the Imposition of Hands, the only essential matter of ordination, and asserts that we use no matter except perhaps the delivery of the Bible: Here is a false statement of a fact so important, that if the Pope believed it, he could not but have decided against our orders; and it appears by the conclusion of the account given by Le Quien, that he did believe it and every other fact stated by Gordon, for the decision was made without any other evidence having been gone into, except the mere reading his petition.

"Gordon next asserts that the only form used was: *Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and administer his holy sacraments*. He had omitted to state the Imposition of Hands, and he here omits the words used with that solemn action, which constitute a most important part of the form of ordination. His statement as to the form being admitted, the determination of the Pope must have been against our orders; but that statement we know was false, and so did Gordon also know when he made it.

"He then notices the defect of intention, arising from our denial of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and here indeed his fact is true, but the reasoning from it we have already seen, on the authority of Bellarmine and of the Synod of Evreux, to be totally erroneous; the intention to ordain to the office for which Christ had ordained, even though accompanied with an explicit, nay an heretical error as to the nature of that office, being sufficient.

"I have followed this subject of the matter, form and intention, through the whole of the petition, that I might not separate the parts of so important a discussion. I now return to where it was first mentioned, and there I find it noticed that we can have no ordination but what was derived to us through Roman Catholic bishops; but to this truth is subjoined a statement, contrived with such jesuitical art, that though the assertion taken literally is not false, yet it inevitably

excites an idea which is decidedly false. Kitchen, of Llandaff, is named by Gordon as the only Roman Catholic bishop who came over to the Protestants in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign; and then he proceeds with his story, tacitly assuming that he was the only bishop from whom Parker, etc., could have obtained consecration, and relating his refusal, and then giving the story of the application to the Irish Archbishop in the Tower, he describes the Nag's Head consecration as the resource to which, of necessity, they were driven.

"It being believed that there was no bishop who could consecrate except Kitchen, his refusal necessarily proved that there had been no real consecration; and we see clearly that Gordon's assertion, true, indeed, if we understand it of bishops in possession of their sees, but untrue if we take it to include all English bishops actually consecrated, was never examined into, but admitted in that sense in which it led to the determination he wished for. It is unnecessary to detain the reader by repeating what has been already said as to the number of Protestant bishops who had been rescued by Providence from the persecution of Mary, to continue the hierarchy of the Church of England—as unnecessary is it to refute the story of the Irish Archbishop.\*

"As to Scorye, Gordon makes no ceremony with him, but says boldly that he was *an apostate monk, not a bishop*: the falsehood of which assertion a little inquiry would have disclosed; but the Pope made no inquiry.

"For the Nag's Head story Gordon gives Haberley as his authority, on the faith of Neal (misprinted Keal), but he chooses to give Neal credit with the Pope, by stating him to have been in exile on account of his religion, of which exile nobody but Gordon ever heard. Indeed the account of Neal, as given by Wood, in his *Antiquities of*

\* This too, as well as the story which it is brought to embellish, is a pure fiction. The first mention of it was in a posthumous publication of Sanders, who referred to an Irish Archbishop, without giving his name. A subsequent writer, Fitz-Simons, in order to invest the fiction with an air of particularity, affirmed that his name was *Creagh*, which a still later writer improved into *Richard Creagh*. It has been clearly proved, however, that there was no Irish Archbishop living at that time who could have acted the part assigned to him. See Elrington, p. 62, Browne's *Story of the Ordination*, p. 42, and the Roman Catholic *Le Courayer*, vol. ii., p. 157, &c., who has clearly shown the impossibility of the alleged fact, and who indeed has so completely exhausted the argument in favor of the Anglican Ordinations, that the English divines who have lived since his time (Mason, Bramhall, and Burnet had written on the same subject before him) have done little more than repeat what he has said.

Oxford, is inconsistent with his ever having been the author of the Nag's Head story, either at home or abroad; for he was appointed Hebrew Lecturer in 1558 or 1559, by Elizabeth, and held the office for many years; he took a distinguished part in the reception of Elizabeth at Oxford, in 1566, and was particularly noticed by her; and in 1590, he erected a monument for himself in Cassington Church, near which he lived after retiring from Oxford, continuing to go sometimes to Church, though not entirely a Protestant; and there is reason to believe that he died in the course of the year in which this monument was erected. We have here no interval of time in which Neal could have been an exile, nor any sufficient cause for his leaving England; and his reception in 1566 by Elizabeth, is utterly inconsistent with his having been employed to prevent the consecration of Parker.

"Gordon relates the form used in the Nag's Head consecration from the account given by Fitzsimon; and, that nothing might be wanting to the story, he confidently asserts Parker to have been a layman, though he must have known that he had been ordained a priest in 1527, according to the Romish ritual.

"This circumstance alone is sufficient to show how little regard was paid to truth, even in a solemn application to the Pope, and that too of such a nature, that to deceive was to incur the guilt of sacrilege, for such the crime of reiterating orders already given is deemed to be by those who esteem orders to be a sacrament.

"Gordon proceeds to state, that in 1613 there came out a book by Francis Mason, in which he pretends to have found a record of our bishops having been ordained by Catholics; but that this story was rejected by all, as he adduced no proof of his assertion.

"Now, we know that Mason never made the assertion here imputed to him, for the bishops he names as consecrators of Parker were Protestants; and we also know that he did adduce proof of his narrative, for he stated where the record which he referred to was to be found, and Gordon knew that it had been examined by his own party, and no mark of forgery discovered in it.

"The memorial concludes by stating, that it had always been the practice in England to re-ordain any of our clergy who became converts to the Church of Rome. How little truth there was in this statement, we have seen already in examining the Bull of Pope *Julius*, and the proceedings in the beginning of the reign of Mary.

"Upon no other evidence whatsoever, except this memorial, Pope

Clement the Eleventh, and his consistory, ordered Gordon to be ordained, thus pronouncing the orders he had received to be invalid.

“Had we known only the decision, without any information as to the grounds upon which it was made, it would hardly be considered justifiable by Roman Catholics to set up their own opinion against that of the Pope and Cardinals ; but, as infallibility does not extend to matter of fact, they will, I hope, think it not unwarrantable to question a decree founded upon such statements as those contained in Gordon’s petition.”

It appears then that this pretty *romance* (I may use the word with etymological propriety) is the ground on which the successors of Paul III. and Pius V. have decreed the nullity of the English Ordinations. To us the decision is of no moment ; since all that has been written and said against our orders is not enough to create in any candid mind even a doubt or suspicion of their validity. For the Romanists, however, the decision has been unfortunate ; inasmuch as it has led to the iteration of orders in the case of those clergymen who have been perverted from us and taken to minister at their altars, and thus polluted their communion at its fountain head with the awful guilt of sacrilege, or sin against the HOLY GHOST.

---

V.—*Preface, Page vi.*

Speaking of the separation of the Puritans from the Church of England, Bishop Stillingfleet observes :

“But if we trace the footsteps of this separation as far as we can, we may find strong probabilities that the Jesuitical party had a great influence on the very first beginnings of it. For which we must consider that, when the Church of England was restored in Queen Elizabeth’s reign, there was no open separation from the communion of it for several years, neither by Papists nor Non-Conformists. At last, the more zealous party of the foreign priests and Jesuits, finding this compliance would, in the end, utterly destroy the popish interest in England, they began to draw off the secret papists from all conformity with our Church, which the old Queen Mary’s priests allowed them in : this raised some heat among themselves, but at last the way of separation prevailed, as the more pure and perfect way. But this was not thought sufficient by these busy factors for the Church of Rome, unless they could, under the same pretence of purity and perfection, draw off Protestants from the communion of this Church,

too. To this purpose persons were employed, under the disguise of more zealous Protestants, to set up the way of more spiritual prayer and greater purity of worship than was observed in the Church of England : that so the people, under these pretences, might be drawn into separate meetings. Of this we have a considerable evidence lately offered to the world, in the examination of a priest so employed at the Council Table, A. D., 1567, being the ninth of Queen Elizabeth, which is published from the Lord Burleigh's Papers, which were in the hands of Archbishop Usher, and from him came to Sir James Ware, whose son brought them into England, and lately caused them to be printed. Two years after, one Heath, a Jesuit, was summoned before the Bishop of Rochester on a like account for disparaging the prayers of the Church, and setting up spiritual prayers above them ; and he declared to the bishops ' that he had been six years in England, and that he had labored to refine the Protestants, and to take off all smacks of ceremonies, and to make the Church purer.' When he was seized on, a letter was found about him from a Jesuit in Spain, wherein he takes notice how he was admired by his flock, and tells him they looked on this way of dividing Protestants as the most effectual to bring them all back to the Church of Rome ; and in his chamber they found a Bull from Pius V. to follow the instructions of the Society for Dividing the Protestants in England, and the license from his fraternity. (Foxes and Firebrands : 1680.) There is one thing in the Jesuit's letter deserves our farther consideration, which the publishers of it did not understand—which is, that Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson, are there mentioned as persons employed to sow a faction among the German heretics ; which he takes to be spoken of the sects in Germany ; but by the German heretics the English Protestants are meant, i. e., Lutherans : and these very men are mentioned by our historians, without knowing of this letter, as the most active and busy in the beginning of the separation. Of these (saith Fuller) Coleman, Button, Hallingham, and Benson, were the chief. At which time (saith Heylin) Benson, Button, Hallingham and Coleman, and others, taking upon them to be of more ardent zeal than others, &c. That time is 1568, which agrees exactly with the date of that letter at Madrid, October 26th, 1568. And both these had it from a much better author than either of them, Camden, I mean, who saith : That while Harding, Sanders, and others, attacked our Church on one side ; Coleman, Button, Hallingham, Benson and others, were busy on the other ; who, under pretence of a purer reformation, opposed the discipline, liturgy, and calling of our bishops, as approaching too near to the Church of Rome. And he makes these the beginners of those quarrels which afterwards brake out with great violence. Now, that there is no improbability in the thing, will appear by the suitableness of these pretences about spiritual prayer, to the doctrine and practices of the Jesuits. For they are professed despisers of the Cathedral Service, and are excused from their attendance on it by the constitutions of their order ; and are as great admirers of spiritual prayer and an enthusiastic way of preaching, as appears by the history of the first institution of their order, by Orlandinus and Maf-

feius. They who are acquainted with their doctrine of spiritual prayer, will find that which is admired and set up here, as so much above set forms, to be one of the lowest of the three sorts among them. That gift of prayer which men have, but requires the exercise of their own gifts to stir it up, they call *oratio acquisita*, acquired prayer; although they say the principle of it is infused. The second is, by a *special immediate influence of the Holy Ghost upon the mind, with the concurrence of infused habits*. The third is far above either of these, which they call the *prayer of contemplation*, and is never given by way of *habit* to any, but lies in *immediate and unexpressible unions*. All these I could easily show to be the doctrine received and magnified by the Roman Church, especially by those who pretend to greater *purity* and *spirituality* than others. But this is sufficient for my purpose, to prove that there is no improbability that they should be the first setters up of this way in England."—*Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*—Preface, pp. 11–14.

FINIS.

# ERRATA.

Page 26, for D, read MM.  
Page 19, for I, read J.







75

